

# THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

Edited by John T. Saywell

VOLUME XLII, NO. 3

SEPTEMBER, 1961

Dafoe, Laurier, and the Formation of Union Government	
Ramsay Cook	185
Peter Mitchell on John A. Macdonald	A. L. Burt 209
Reviews ( <i>see following page</i> )	228
Graduate Theses in Canadian History and Related Subjects	256
Recent Publications Relating to Canada	267
Books Received	272
Notes and Comments ( <i>see following page</i> )	275

---

---

PUBLISHED BY UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS

## REVIEWS

GRAHAM, Arthur Meighen. I. <i>The Door of Opportunity</i> : by H. Blair Neatby .....	228
UNDERHILL, <i>In Search of Canadian Liberalism</i> : by Robin W. Winks .....	229
SAYWELL, ed., <i>The Canadian Journal of Lady Aberdeen, 1893-1898</i> : by W. L. Morton .....	231
VIAU, Cavelier de la Salle; FLEURY, <i>Les Fougueux Bâtisseurs de la Nouvelle France</i> ; BENOIT, <i>Maisonneuve</i> : by W. J. Eccles .....	233
OUELLET, ed., <i>Papineau</i> : by Ramsay Cook .....	234
<i>Les Cahiers des Dix</i> , 25: by Jacques Monet, S. J. ....	235
KILBOURN, <i>The Elements Combined: A History of the Steel Company of Canada</i> : by Margaret Prang .....	236
DENISON, <i>The People's Power: The History of Ontario Hydro</i> : by Charles W. Humphries .....	237
HART and HONORÉ, <i>Causation in the Law</i> : by William Dray .....	238
HALPERIN, ed., <i>Some 20th Century Historians: Essays on Eminent Europeans</i> : by Richard M. Saunders .....	240
MARCUS, <i>Quiberon Bay: The Campaign in Home Waters, 1759</i> ; PATTERSON, <i>The Other Armada: The Franco-Spanish Attempt to Invade Britain in 1779</i> : by Richard Glover .....	240
GRAUBARD, <i>Burke, Disraeli, and Churchill: The Politics of Perseverance</i> : by Albert V. Tucker .....	242
LOUBÈRE, Louis Blanc: <i>His Life and His Contributions to French Jacobin-Socialism</i> : by Lenore O'Boyle .....	242
CLARK, <i>The Rise of the British Treasury: Colonial Administration in the Eighteenth Century</i> : by John Norris .....	243
RUNCIMAN, <i>The White Rajahs: A History of Sarawak from 1841 to 1946</i> : by P. Harnetty .....	244
GEORGE, Lloyd George: by H. W. McCready .....	245
PELLING, <i>Modern Britain, 1885-1955</i> ; ASHWORTH, <i>An Economic History of England, 1870-1939</i> ; YOUNGSON, <i>The British Economy, 1920-1957</i> : by J. B. Conacher .....	246
RAYMOND, ed., <i>The Baldwin Age</i> : by Stephen R. Graubard .....	249
CRANE, Mr. Carr of State: <i>Forty-Seven Years in the Department of State</i> : by John C. Cairns .....	250
NOTED .....	250
HISTORY PAPERBACKS .....	254

## NOTES AND COMMENTS

Dictionary of Canadian Biography; Historians in Canada; Contributors .....	275
--	-----

## THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW Continuing

### *The Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada*

Founded at the University of Toronto in 1896

Articles in the REVIEW are indexed in the *Canadian Index* and in the *International Index to Periodical Literature*.

Communications with regard to subscriptions and advertising should be addressed to The Director, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada. Individual subscriptions \$4.00 a year.

AUTHORIZED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER BY THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OTTAWA

## Dafoe, Laurier, and the Formation of Union Government

RAMSAY COOK

THE ISSUES SURROUNDING THE ENACTMENT OF CONSCRIPTION and the formation of Union government are among the most contentious in recent Canadian history. On the one hand these events may be seen as a superb patriotic effort to assist Great Britain in the winning of the Great War. A variation of this view might characterize them as colonial Canada's reply to the call for assistance from imperial Britain. On the other hand they can, and have been interpreted as a plot on the part of scheming anti-Quebec politicians to preserve their slipping hold on office. As a sidelight to this main charge the suggestion has been made that the central objective of the promoters of Union government was to produce an administration sympathetic to the sagging fortunes of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern Railways. Also the suspicion has sometimes been raised that Union government was part of a plan to re-organize the British empire on a centralized basis. A final comment that is frequently made about the Unionist movement is that it destroyed that national unity which had been so carefully built, brick by brick, by Sir Wilfrid Laurier during his fifteen years of office. All of these suggestions were made in a variety of ways in 1917 and have been given some standing in the official life of Laurier, written by O. D. Skelton in 1922 while the issues were still hot. As yet, however, no thorough study has been made of the available contemporary evidence in an attempt to place together all the pieces in the enormous puzzle.

A survey of the events from the outbreak of war in August, 1914, to the election of 1917 as seen through the eyes of J. W. Dafoe suggests that the complete explanation for the support which the Unionist movement won has not yet been offered. It also suggests that much that has been written about conscription, Union government, and the

racial rupture of 1917 has been taken at face value from the contentions of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his followers. Laurier was undoubtedly a most attractive figure, but he was also a practising politician—"a man who had affinities with Machiavelli as well as Sir Galahad," as Dafoe once wrote. Therefore his views are those of a man deeply engaged in political warfare; they are also only one side of the story.

Some of the details of the Unionist side can be learned by following the course which led John Dafoe to a complete break with Laurier after twenty-five years of close association. To do so requires consideration of several problems which on the surface seem to have only a tenuous connection with the disruption of 1917. These include some excursions into the tangled maze of Manitoba politics and, more particularly, a discussion of that well-worn theme—the French-language controversy in Manitoba and Ontario. These questions played an important part in destroying that unity of purpose which had characterized the country's attitude at the outset of the war. An analysis of Dafoe's attitude to these events, as well as to the critical problems of the latter half of 1917, not only helps to explain the shattering of the Laurier Liberal party, but also suggests that Canadian nationalism has more subtleties than it is sometimes allowed by Canadian historians.

As the European crisis came to a head in the late summer of 1914, John Dafoe, like most Manitobans, was giving his undivided attention to the provincial election campaign which was just drawing to a close. The *Free Press* editor, though he had always prided himself on a more than provincial interest in international affairs, was thus caught off his balance when he learned that a European war was virtually inevitable. At first he warned his readers to remain calm and wait upon events. But he left no doubt that, "If Great Britain is involved in war either by her own decision that the circumstances leave no option, or through the aggression of an outside party, it is quite certain that Canada will come to her assistance with all the power at her disposal."<sup>1</sup> Two days later *Free Press* subscribers were told that the Rubicon had been crossed and the issues clarified: "Upon the issue of the conflict depends the future of the Empire and the freedom of the world."<sup>2</sup> On August 6, the morning edition carried the terrible message on its front page, "Canada In State of War for First Time Since Becoming a Nation."<sup>3</sup> Thus, from the outset, the Great War was Canada's war.

Once it became clear that Great Britain was involved in war, Dafoe never wavered from the position that it was Canada's duty to become

<sup>1</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, Aug. 3, 1914.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, Aug. 5, 1914.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, Aug. 6, 1914.



an active participant. Canadian involvement in the war, however, was not that of a colony assisting the mother country, but rather of partner nations united together in defence of a cause which in Dafoe's eyes was greater than the empire—the cause of freedom and democracy.<sup>4</sup> Since Canada was a full-fledged participant in the struggle for the preservation of democracy and not a mere supporting actor, the country had to be prepared to give of its blood and treasure in unstinted measure. This was made clear when the *Free Press* announced that "Whatever good things have come out of Germany it has given the world no democratic impulse. The victory of the Allies, and it must come at whatever cost and at whatever sacrifice, will feed anew the rivers of democracy flooding weary lands thirsting for freedom."<sup>5</sup> Sweeping aside the legal technicalities, Dafoe was convinced that Canada entered the war as a nation fighting for cherished values. Canada was one of the Allies.

At the outset of the conflict, of course, few Canadians stopped to underline this distinction. It was a measure of Dafoe's nationalism that he made it. The country, for whatever reasons, was united in its acceptance of participation in the war, and few suspected that the struggle would be of such duration as to demand that Canada exert the "totality of its powers."<sup>6</sup> Without stopping to ask exact definition of words or to interpret subtle nuances of phrase the vast majority of Canadians must have accepted the claim of the *Free Press* that the co-operation of the Dominions in the war effort justified the shape the empire had taken:

All the world knows that Canada, like the other self-governing Dominions, has gone into this war with the determination to fight shoulder to shoulder with Great Britain to the finish, under no compulsion save that of conscience and duty and devotion to the ideals of civilization of which the British flag is the symbol.<sup>7</sup>

This was an expression of responsible nationalism, not of sycophantic colonialism or aggressive imperialism. Canada was not fighting for Great Britain; she was fighting "shoulder to shoulder" with Britain and the other self-governing members of the empire.

Since Canada was engaged in a war abroad, it seemed reasonable to Dafoe that a political truce should be signed at home. He hoped it could be achieved, but his scepticism was apparent when he wrote in the first days of the war that "Sir Robert Borden at this juncture is entitled to the co-operation, sympathy and support of the Liberal party in Parliament. This he will get if he can keep Mr. Rogers and his news-

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, Aug. 8, 1914.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, Sept. 7, 1914.

<sup>6</sup>J. W. Dafoe, *Sir Clifford Sifton in Relation to His Times* (Toronto, 1931), 406.

<sup>7</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, Sept. 19, 1914.

paper echoes in hand."<sup>8</sup> He warned the Liberals that their duty was to give unflinching support to every proposal to forward the war effort.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless he was aware that there were stirrings in the political atmosphere, especially in the Conservative party, to keep controversy alive and bring on an election in the tense war situation. Borden's Minister of Public Works, Robert Rogers, was the leading suspect. The *Free Press* argued that there should be a complete retreat from party government in the normal sense during the crisis and roundly attacked anyone suspected of fomenting dissension during the first months of the war.<sup>10</sup>

Both Liberals and Conservatives were conscious of the election possibilities created by the war. In December, 1914, Laurier wrote to Dafoe warning him that although the first wartime session of parliament had not ended in the expected dissolution, an early session in 1915 might be followed by an appeal to the country. He underlined the importance of "going ahead with our preparations."<sup>11</sup> Similar thoughts were running through the minds of prominent Conservatives.<sup>12</sup> Dafoe wanted to prevent both parties from disrupting the war effort for political ends. Throughout 1915 the *Free Press* repeatedly warned about the perils of partisanship. In mid-1915 a somewhat vague proposal for a coalition government was made.<sup>13</sup> As the constitutional limit on Parliament's duration drew nearer fears increased in Dafoe's mind that the Liberals, seeing an advantage in the growing weaknesses of the Conservatives, might force an election.<sup>14</sup> The *Free Press* argued that an election should be prevented by an extension of the life of the existing Parliament<sup>15</sup> and expressed enthusiastic approval when the parties agreed to take this step.<sup>16</sup>

The truce advocated by the *Free Press* during the first two years of the war did not mean that the paper was uncritical of the Government's military programme. But it did drop much of its partisan tone when dealing with national politics. When the paper criticized the Borden administration it was usually for not doing enough. Repeatedly Dafoe's paper demanded a more active recruiting campaign.<sup>17</sup> But

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, Aug. 6, 1914.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, Nov. 16, 1914.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, Oct. 10, 12, 20, 1914.

<sup>11</sup>Public Archives of Canada (henceforth P.A.C.), Dafoe Papers, Laurier to Dafoe, Dec. 16, 1914.

<sup>12</sup>P.A.C., Willison Papers, Sir John Willison to Sir Edward Kemp, May 5, 1915.

<sup>13</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, May 12, 1915.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, Dec. 6, 1915.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, Dec. 30, 1915.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, Feb. 10, 1916.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, Oct. 14, 1914; Nov. 13, 1914; Nov. 20, 1914.

politics in the partisan sense were largely banished from the newspaper's comments on the federal Government.

In Manitoba a different situation obtained. Dafoe's *Free Press* had long been the bitterest critic of Sir Rodmond Roblin's Conservative government. Therefore the cessation of political asperities on the national front never tempted Dafoe to adopt a similar attitude toward the local Conservatives. This fact boded ill for the continuance of national political peace because of the close connection between the Manitoba Premier and his former colleague, Robert Rogers, federal Minister of Public Works.<sup>18</sup> It is thus somewhat ironic that the demission of Roblin's government in May, 1915, rather than contributing to political peace, led directly to new disturbances which spilled over into federal politics and set the stage for the destruction of the unity of the Liberal party. The source of this new friction was the ever irritable school question which cut across party lines and threatened the nation's unity. With the Liberal party finally in power in Manitoba, Dafoe grasped the opportunity to press for long advocated educational reforms. These reforms demanded the removal of the multiplicity of languages from Manitoba schools, and their replacement by English. For Dafoe this was necessary not simply for educational reasons, but also for national reasons. The common school was to be made the effective agency of the Canadian *Kulturkampf*. "Our gates are open to the oppressed of Europe," the *Free Press* explained, "but when they come here they must forget their feuds, forswear their racial aspirations, and become Canadians not only in name but in fact."<sup>19</sup> The new Liberal administration agreed essentially with the *Free Press* view that all non-English privileges, including the meagre rights that had been allowed to the French Canadians after 1897, should be removed from Manitoba's educational structure. After a quarter of a century of controversy Manitoba schools were thus transformed into exclusively English language institutions.<sup>20</sup> But the controversy was by no means concluded.

The educational reforms in Manitoba coincided with the growing agitation being carried on by the French-Canadian leaders in Ontario against less radical changes brought about by the famous Regulation 17. Clearly there was a serious racial fracas boiling up in the early months of 1916. The question of bilingual schools was not one that could be easily kept within the confines of Manitoba and Ontario, for the province of Quebec naturally felt that its interests were at stake.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, June 3, 1915.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, Aug. 10, 1914.

<sup>20</sup>W. L. Morton, *Manitoba: A History* (Toronto, 1957), 352.

Thus, the eruption of the question into national politics was all but inevitable. That this should happen when the war was entering a new and serious phase and the manpower situation was beginning to evoke incriminating glances at the French Canadians only increased the explosiveness of the language issue. In the early months of 1916 Laurier consulted with his provincial leaders in both Manitoba and Ontario in an effort to encourage their opposition to any limitations that might be placed upon French-language rights in the provinces.<sup>21</sup> The Conservative party was also feeling the pressure of racial tensions. Prime Minister Borden was faced with a revolt on the part of his French-Canadian ministers who threatened to absent themselves from Cabinet meetings until some action was taken by the federal authorities to ensure that the French-language privileges would be respected by the provinces.<sup>22</sup> While Borden was able to adopt the position that the federal government could not interfere in the provinces' control of educational matters,<sup>23</sup> Laurier was faced with a more threatening situation. His claim to the leadership of his people was at stake. In April, 1916, he began considering the introduction of a resolution into the federal parliament requesting the province of Ontario to recognize the French-language rights.<sup>24</sup> Over the opposition of provincial lieutenants and federal advisers<sup>25</sup> he decided to take the dangerous step. The carefully phrased Lapointe resolution came before the House of Commons on May 9, 1916.<sup>26</sup> Moderate though the resolution was, the intensity of feeling evoked by the war was allowed full vent in the subsequent debate. Though the resolution referred specifically to Ontario, it interested Canadians everywhere, especially in Manitoba.

The question raised by the Lapointe resolution was of that rare category which may cause even the most ardent partisan to sunder his party allegiance. John Dafoe was convinced that Laurier had committed the gravest error in introducing into federal politics a question that belonged only in the provincial arena. Naturally his conviction was strengthened by the belief that Ontario and Manitoba had acted correctly in their educational reforms. He was prepared therefore to place his convictions above his loyalty to Laurier—a loyalty which had never been blind. He expressed his conviction to an old French-Canadian friend who accused him of fathering the new Manitoba

<sup>21</sup>P.A.C., Laurier Papers, Laurier to T. C. Norris, Feb. 22, 1916; Laurier to N. W. Rowell, March 1, 1916.

<sup>22</sup>P.A.C., Borden Papers, T. C. Casgrain, P. E. Blondin, E. L. Patinaude to Borden, April 20, 1916.

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, Borden to T. C. Casgrain, P. E. Blondin, E. L. Patinaude, April 24, 1916.

<sup>24</sup>Laurier Papers, L. O. David to Laurier, April 15, 1916.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, N. W. Rowell to Laurier, April 15, 1916; W. S. Fielding to Laurier, April 23, 1916.

<sup>26</sup>Wade, Mason, *The French Canadians* (New York, 1955), 696.

school legislation and warned him that he had "brought into the world a child who has all the appearances of a monster."<sup>27</sup> Dafoe's rejoinder was that he was only one of a number of parents who had come to see that the "absurd arrangement arrived at in 1897" could no longer be allowed to exist "if the province of Manitoba was not to be transformed into middle Europe on a small scale." Of course, the French might have been given special consideration, but the obvious fact was that their leaders, especially the clergy, intended to use their privileges to transform the schools into clerical institutions, thus destroying the willingness of Manitobans to give them preferential treatment. If the French acted in a reasonable manner they would probably be given fair treatment, Dafoe asserted, but the province had no intention of being intimidated by the people of Quebec "who appear to think they have a right to impose their will throughout the length and breadth of Canada." This delusion was the belief of Henri Bourassa and the Quebec Liberals had succumbed to his influence. He continued with evident heat:

I know that you boast that you have beaten Bourassa and put him out of business; but as a matter of fact he has conquered you. He may not command your allegiance but he controls your minds. You all think his thoughts, talk his language, echo his threats; and I should suspect that when Sir Wilfrid Laurier passes away—may that day be long distant—that you will accept him as your chief.<sup>28</sup>

The suggestion that the French Canadians were entitled to equal rights throughout the Dominion sparked from Dafoe a further exposition of his growing suspicion that the Liberal party was falling under the long shadow of Henri Bourassa. The acceptance of Bourassa's views could only lead to the formation of political parties on racial lines. "I should be sorry to see anything like this happen," he concluded darkly, "but I have no doubt that this will happen if the Nationalist movement in Quebec becomes more formidable than it is, and swallows up both the Liberal and Conservative parties as it gives promise of doing."<sup>29</sup>

Prior to the Lapointe resolution Dafoe had publicly warned the Liberal party of the danger of countenancing any federal interference in the provinces' educational affairs.<sup>30</sup> Early in May he travelled to Ottawa to exert his personal influence directly with the party leadership. He talked with Laurier and found him "stubborn as an army mule." As Dafoe saw matters, the party was inextricably caught on the horns of a dilemma. "If the whole party follows Laurier, the party is

<sup>27</sup>Dafoe Papers, Thomas Coté to Dafoe, March 27, 1916.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, Dafoe to Thomas Coté, April 6, 1916.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, April 17, 1916.

<sup>30</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, April 15, 1916.

gone; if the French follow him, Laurier is gone as a national leader."<sup>31</sup> Sir Clifford Sifton was outraged at Laurier's attitude. In his characteristic, downright way he described the Liberal leader as acting "the part of a boy who has just been elected for a back concession and thinks that he will not be elected again unless he shouts for his county." The sooner the party was rid of him, the better for the entire country.<sup>32</sup> But where Dafoe was unsuccessful in influencing Laurier, he was in a stronger position with the western Liberal members. Apart from their personal views they were fully aware of the weight that the *Manitoba Free Press* carried in their "back concessions." Dafoe's influence was therefore important in producing the split which divided the Liberal party when the roll call on the Lapointe resolution was taken.<sup>33</sup> Eleven western Liberals and one from Ontario kicked over the party traces and opposed the passage of the resolution.<sup>34</sup> The rupture of national unity and the beginning of western severance of its loyalty to the Liberal party were thus the two most important consequences of the debate on the school controversy in the federal parliament in the spring of 1916. Both Laurier and Dafoe, in their separate ways, were responsible for these developments: Laurier because he had approved the tactics of the Lapointe resolution, Dafoe because he had encouraged the western Liberals to break with their leader.

Even before the episode of the Lapointe resolution Dafoe had come to the conclusion that the majority of the Quebec leaders had fallen under the spell of Bourassa, but he had not yet placed Laurier under this condemnation. By May, 1916, however, he was no longer sure that Laurier was uncontaminated. In the *Free Press* he placed the responsibility for the Lapointe resolution squarely on Laurier's shoulders. Moreover he made it clear that "there will be no yielding at any point to these Nationalist demands, which have so unaccountably received the blessing of the French Liberal chiefs."<sup>35</sup> Everywhere but in Quebec, where the Liberals were already too strong, the result of the foolhardy Lapointe resolution would be a serious weakening of the party. In the West, only the Laurier Liberals would suffer, for the western Liberals had issued their declaration of independence. This action should be followed by the formation of a radical, progressive western Liberal party, the *Free Press* advised. In contrast to the exist-

<sup>31</sup>P.A.C., Sifton Papers, Dafoe to Sifton, May 7, 1916.

<sup>32</sup>Dafoe Papers, Sifton to Dafoe, May 11, 1916.

<sup>33</sup>J. W. Dafoe, *Laurier: A Study in Canadian Politics* (Toronto, 1922), 161-2.

<sup>34</sup>O. D. Skelton, *The Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier* (2 vols., London, 1922), II, 488.

<sup>35</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, May 12, 1916.



ing parties the members of the new group "will be far more interested in furthering their programme than in office-holding and will be indifferent to the time-servers and opportunists to whom the enjoyment of office is the be-all and end-all of political existence. 'To Your Tents, O Israel!'"<sup>36</sup>

Thus the Lapointe resolution can be seen as the first tremor in an approaching earthquake in Canadian politics. The language question had been aired and set aside, but firm positions had been occupied and French and English in Canada now peered across a gulf at one another through spectacles smeared with renewed distrust. The tremor seriously shook Dafoe's faith in the Liberal leadership. He had disagreed with Laurier in a more fundamental way than ever before, and this time the western Liberal members had followed his teachings. Though he was not ready to break finally with Laurier yet, he no longer trusted the old man.

Dafoe's distrust of Laurier increased his anxiety to prevent an election. The country was in a state of turmoil and opposition to the Borden government was growing increasingly apparent. It was possible that the benefit of this discontent might not accrue to the Liberals, but even if it did, Dafoe was not anxious to see them returned to power. If Laurier, back in office, surrounded himself with the old guard, no advance on the existing government's hesitant leadership could be expected. Dafoe offered these reflections to Sifton and concluded by pointing out that there was one possibility that would require careful watching:

I have some reason to believe that some very daring spirits in the Conservative party are trying to induce the Government to adopt conscription for the purpose of bringing the trouble in Quebec to a head with a view to a dissolution at that particular moment. So daring a stroke might save the Government, with the consequences that the domestic peace of Canada might be threatened.<sup>37</sup>

Perhaps that was just another of those rumours that frequently circulated in political smoking rooms, but it suggested that Canadian politics were entering a profoundly unsettled state. The disruption created by the French-language question and the increasingly frequent criticisms that were being directed at the Borden administration edged open the flood gates through which began to flow the currents of renewed political strife.

Dafoe's declining confidence in Laurier's leadership in the spring of 1916 was not coupled with any growing attraction to the existing Conservative government. He was disturbed by the repeated charges of

<sup>36</sup>*Ibid.*, May 13, 1916.

<sup>37</sup>Sifton Papers, Dafoe to Sifton, Oct. 17, 1916.

corruption in the Conservative direction of the war effort and felt justified in encouraging a vigilant Opposition.<sup>38</sup> But more disquieting than the evidence of corruption was the critical manpower situation. If the war was to be fought to a decisive conclusion Canada and her allies had to keep their military strength at full capacity. Premier Borden recognized that necessity when, in January, 1916, he called for an increase in Canada's forces to 500,000 men. This objective, which was to be achieved by voluntary enlistment, had the full support of the *Free Press*.<sup>39</sup> But before the end of 1916 it was obvious to anyone with eyes to see that the necessary men could not be obtained by voluntary means. For a variety of reasons, including Government blundering, the stream of enlistments had dwindled to a trickle.<sup>40</sup> What could be done to meet this critical situation? In April, 1916, the *Free Press* expressed the view that conscription, at least under a party government, would lack the necessary support of a united public.<sup>41</sup> But was there any alternative to conscription?

During the summer of 1916 Dafoe began to move toward a possible solution to the combined political and manpower problem. One thing was patently clear—the existing leadership had failed.<sup>42</sup> In December, 1916, the *Free Press* offered its readers a depressing appraisal of the country's political situation:

We have had during the war a mean-spirited, selfish, far from competent, patronage-dispensing Government, made up in large part of inveterate and embittered partisans, whose first thought is for themselves and their positions and the jobs and patronage they can deliver to their supporters. . . .

The Liberal opposition has retaliated, as was inevitable, with the consequence that we have not a united people intent upon the greatest task that ever fell to our nation, but a country distracted by partisan strife, drifting surely and steadily into a General Election which will still further divide the people into warring factions.<sup>43</sup>

But even as he was writing these lines Dafoe was working out a solution which he hoped would save the country from renewed political conflict and provide the leadership necessary to prevent the war effort from slowing to a halt. He was convinced that the chief members of the Borden government, led by Robert Rogers, were corruptionists. The Prime Minister himself was "a well meaning incompetent." But the Liberals were no better. "No Liberal Government made up of the

<sup>38</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, April 12, 1916.

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, April 14, 1916.

<sup>40</sup>A. M. Willms, "Conscription 1917: A Brief for the Defence," *C.H.R.*, XXXVII, 4 (Dec. 1956), 342-5.

<sup>41</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, April 17, 1916.

<sup>42</sup>*Ibid.*, Oct. 4, 1916.

<sup>43</sup>*Ibid.*, Dec. 20, 1916.



public men in sight could give the people of Canada what they want: a leadership so plainly disinterested and competent as to command their whole-hearted support," he wrote confidently. Since an electoral duel between the existing party leaders could produce no satisfactory result and would only divide the country, it had to be avoided. One possibility would be to replace half the existing cabinet with Conservative businessmen like Augustus Nanton, the two Galts, and Sir Joseph Flavelle. The other possibility was a coalition between the Liberals and the Conservatives. Canadian history offered an encouraging parallel. Dafoe hardly needed to remind G. M. Wrong that, "If Brown and Macdonald could sink their differences—personal and political—to bring about Confederation, Sir Wilfrid and Sir Robert (between whom there is personal friendship) might be able to loyally combine for a far greater purpose."<sup>44</sup> Such a coalition seemed the obvious course to promote.

As the year 1917 opened Dafoe began his campaign for a union government. He admitted that the arrangement would not be easily achieved. "It will require the united effort of the nation," he argued, "to substitute a National Government for blind partisan leadership of the blind."<sup>45</sup> Dafoe was one of many people who were prepared to make the effort. In February of the new year he travelled to Ottawa on business. While there he took the opportunity to survey the political scene. His observations were hardly encouraging. "Both sides," he concluded, "are bent on playing the old party game with all its vigour, just as though we were not in the third year of the greatest war that has ever been seen." The Government, he suspected, wanted to maintain office for the benefit of its supporters, and hoped to force a further extension of the parliamentary term. The Opposition, believing that discontent throughout the country favoured it, was not disposed to permit any further postponement of an election. Dafoe felt certain that the Liberal interpretation was wrong; the country was equally disgusted with them, and they would suffer especially from anti-Quebec propaganda. As far as the West was concerned its sympathies were either "populist" or independent Liberal. Probably a national government, an idea which was gaining considerable support in the East, was the best solution.<sup>46</sup> That Dafoe's view of the situation was fairly accurate is suggested by a remark made by Sir Joseph Flavelle that the main concern of the two parties in the spring of 1917 was "How to win for the party."<sup>47</sup>

<sup>44</sup>Dafoe Papers, Dafoe to G. M. Wrong, Dec. 12, 1916.

<sup>45</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, Jan. 13, 1917.

<sup>46</sup>Sifton Papers, Dafoe to Sifton, Feb. 12, 1917.

<sup>47</sup>P.A.C., Flavelle Papers, Sir Joseph Flavelle to R. H. Brand, March 14, 1917.

The Liberals were certainly preparing for an election. In April Laurier sent George Graham and E. M. MacDonald west to scout the situation. He then consulted Dafoe directly on the advisability of an election.<sup>48</sup> Dafoe repeated his view that although the Government was obviously in a weak position, the Liberals would be put on the defensive if they forced an appeal to the country. A Conservative defeat seemed inevitable "unless some new factor enters the contest and gives them a good battle cry," he admitted, but there were other factors to consider. The Conservatives could invoke the Quebec whipping-horse, making good use of the indiscretions of certain Quebec Liberals. Such an appeal would find much sympathy in English Canada. Perhaps hoping to discourage Laurier, he concluded with an eye to the future:

I think it very necessary in the interests of the whole country that a Liberal Government should be in office for the period immediately following the war. I don't think anything can prevent this coming about unless in some way the Liberals throw the control of the situation into the hands of the Government. They might do this by forcing an election. They ought, therefore, to be very sure that they are right before going forward.<sup>49</sup>

On his return from the meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet and visits to the front early in May, Sir Robert Borden threw the confused political situation into further disorder by announcing that the Government would ask parliament to adopt legislation providing for military conscription. The *Manitoba Free Press* immediately agreed that conscription was necessary, but insisted that it could not be carried out by a party government. The Canadian people would only trust a national, win-the-war government with such extensive powers.<sup>50</sup> On May 29 Borden proposed to Laurier that a coalition should be formed to enforce the proposed enlistment policy. On the following day Dafoe informed the Liberal leader, "I am bound to say that I think that public opinion is very strongly in favour of the formation of a National Government and the adoption of whatever policy is necessary to secure such reinforcements for our troops at the front as will prevent the gradual disappearance of our armies by wastage."<sup>51</sup> Laurier, however, clung to his long-standing promise to oppose conscription and refused to enter a coalition pledged to its implementation.<sup>52</sup>

Thus conscription came to Canada, and with it a political revolution. Laurier chose to oppose compulsory enlistment in keeping with the

<sup>48</sup>Laurier Papers, Laurier to Dafoe, April 10, 1917.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, Dafoe to Laurier, April 26, 1917.

<sup>50</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, May 21, 1917.

<sup>51</sup>Laurier Papers, Dafoe to Laurier, May 30, 1917.

<sup>52</sup>Skelton, *Laurier*, II, 512-13.

promise he had made at the outset of the war. His grounds for opposition are worthy of note:

In the Province of Quebec I have been accused by the Nationalists of being a conscious or unconscious Jingoist and of leading the country to conscription. This was on account of the truth which I often proclaimed that our position in the British Empire might make it imperative for us to participate in wars in which Britain might be engaged. At the same time I asserted that this did not lead to conscription, and that I was opposed to conscription. The statement was never objected to by either friend or foe, the Nationalists excepted. If I were now to take a different attitude, I would simply hand over the Province to the Nationalists, and the consequences might be very serious.<sup>53</sup>

Two points should be emphasized concerning Laurier's view. First, Laurier agreed that Canada might be called upon to assist in British wars. Dafoe, and those of his stripe, saw the matter in a different light—Canada was fighting her own war in co-operation with Great Britain and the Dominions. Secondly, Laurier clearly expressed his fear that if he supported conscription he would lose the leadership of the French Canadians to Henri Bourassa. Dafoe in his study of Laurier proposed the thesis that Laurier's career after 1911 could best be understood in terms of two objectives: "to win back if he could the Prime Ministership of Canada; but in any event to establish his position forever as the unquestioned, unchallenged leader of his people." When the two objectives conflicted, Dafoe believed that Laurier invariably chose the second.<sup>54</sup> It has been strongly argued that Dafoe's assessment was wrong and that Laurier's decisions were always made from the point of view of what in his judgment would best preserve national unity.<sup>55</sup> Yet in the case of conscription it is obvious from Laurier's letter that his most acute fear during the conscription crisis was that he would lose Quebec to the Nationalists. Of course he argued that such an eventuality would jeopardize national unity. The fear was entirely justified, but it failed to take account of the fact that the majority of English Canadians supported conscription as enthusiastically as the French Canadians opposed it, as the election of December, 1917, indicated. Whatever choice Laurier, or any other politician made, national unity was threatened. Laurier quite naturally made the choice which placed him in agreement with his compatriots. Perhaps Dafoe oversimplified Laurier's motivation and failed to see that the Liberal leader was really faced with an insoluble dilemma,

<sup>53</sup>Laurier Papers, Laurier to A. C. Hardy, May 29, 1917.

<sup>54</sup>Dafoe, *Laurier*, 156-7.

<sup>55</sup>H. Blair Neatby, *Laurier and a Liberal Quebec*, (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto, 1955), 385.

but it can hardly be doubted that Dafoe struck upon one of the primary impulses which brought Laurier to his anti-conscriptionist position.

Dafoe, of course, supported conscription, but he seriously doubted that it could be implemented successfully by a party government that had lost much of its support in the country. The *Free Press* warned of the danger of combining political partisanship with compulsory enlistment:

National unity such as Canada has scarcely known is imperative for conscription as a practical policy; the issue in its present form is already being exploited in the interests of partisan politics. The measure may be good, but the methods hitherto pursued are as bad as any methods could easily be.<sup>56</sup>

Both Liberals and Conservatives were exploiting conscription for political advantage, Dafoe believed. A means of preventing continued partisanship had to be found—a means, it was hoped, that would ensure the country's united support of the necessary recruiting policy.<sup>57</sup>

In mid-June Dafoe again journeyed to Ottawa where he had a brief, inconclusive interview with Laurier who was now suggesting that conscription should be postponed until after a national referendum.<sup>58</sup> Dafoe also consulted with the western Liberals with a view to having them form an independent group which could force both parties to accept a further extension of parliament. He still believed that an election was the most serious threat to national unity.<sup>59</sup>

Back in Winnipeg, Dafoe conducted some further tests of the political temperature. T. A. Crerar, "the big man in the farmers' movement," believed that a western bloc of Liberals and farmers should be sent to Ottawa.<sup>60</sup> Certainly there was little sympathy for Laurier's viewpoint. Dafoe decided that the time had now come to break completely with Laurier. Perhaps the Quebec situation would have been better if Laurier had been taken into the Government at the outset of the war, but the opportunity had been missed and the time had come to face the realities of Quebec politics. The *Free Press* gave its frank assessment.

The authentic voice of Quebec today is that of Bourassa. He has been stating his views with perfect frankness. He says Quebec is against the war. Laurier is at best a moderating, not a controlling power in Quebec. If he came into a coalition government he would leave Quebec behind him. This is why the problem now before the people of Canada must be solved, if there is any solution, without the assistance of Laurier or Quebec.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>56</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, June 1, 1917.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*, June 13, 1917.

<sup>58</sup>Laurier Papers, Laurier to Dafoe, June 20, 1917.

<sup>59</sup>Dafoe, *Sifton*, 405.

<sup>60</sup>Dafoe Papers, Dafoe to Sifton, June 27, 1917.

<sup>61</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, June 25, 1917.

The only solution, as Dafoe saw it, was a coalition government without the support of Laurier and Quebec. "Even majorities have rights in this country," the *Free Press* remarked angrily. By mid-July, 1917, the Winnipeg newspaper had read all the anti-conscriptionists out of the Liberal party.<sup>62</sup>

During another visit to Ottawa in early July Dafoe freely expressed his conviction that despite Laurier's refusal to join a coalition the cause of national government was far from dead. He was confident that a plan satisfactory to western leaders could be devised.<sup>63</sup> What was necessary was to unite all the conscriptionist forces so as to smother the Laurier Liberals. "If we can prevent a party fight in the West we shall have no trouble with the foreigners," he assured Premier Borden.<sup>64</sup> But the western Liberal leaders were fully aware of their own strength and were reluctant to throw their weight behind Borden. Dafoe talked with the western Liberal leaders and reported the results to N. W. Rowell, one of the chief eastern promoters of the Unionist cause:

I could see that their preference was to fight the coming election as a Western group on the platform to be adopted next month, and after thus proving their strength to join the Conservatives in a Union Government for the balance of the war. They seemed to fear that if they went into a Union Government at present they might not carry the whole Liberal strength in Western Canada with them; whereas by the other course they thought it might be possible to keep the party intact as a factor behind the war government. You will undoubtedly recognize the point of view as not being altogether different from that held by some of the Eastern leaders.<sup>65</sup>

The future of the coalition movement seemed to rest with the Western Liberal Convention which was to meet in Winnipeg on August 7 to draw up a platform for the increasingly independent western wing of the Liberal party. The *Free Press* probably gauged western sentiment fairly accurately when it claimed that the West

has no confidence in the present Dominion Government as a whole or in any member of it as an individual. It admits no allegiance either to the leaders on the other side of the House.

The Canadian West is in the mood to break away from the past affiliations and traditions and inaugurate a new political era of sturdy support for advanced and radical programmes. The break up of the parties has given the West its opportunity; and there is no doubt but that it will take advantage of it.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>62</sup>*Ibid.*, July 7, 1917.

<sup>63</sup>Willison Papers, Arthur Ford to Sir John Willison, July 19, 1917.

<sup>64</sup>Borden Papers, Dafoe to Borden, July 18, 1917.

<sup>65</sup>Dafoe Papers, Dafoe to N. W. Rowell, July 25, 1917.

<sup>66</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, June 28, 1917.

But even in the radical West war policies were matters of prime concern, especially the questions of conscription and coalition government.

Laurier hoped that the Winnipeg convention would confine itself to the questions of domestic politics which affected the West, but he feared that Sir Clifford Sifton would try to commit the delegates to conscription. He advised his supporters to avoid the conscription issue and follow the policy he was advocating—that of leaving conscription an open question to be settled by individual consciences.<sup>67</sup> Both the conscription and anti-conscription forces were manoeuvring for control of the western Liberal meeting. The Laurier Liberals feared that the Siftons, Dafoe, and Calder of Saskatchewan were throwing all their influence and money behind a conscriptionist delegation.<sup>68</sup> The proponents of conscription, on the other hand, were suspicious that the men who controlled the party machine and especially the large foreign vote were attempting to pack the gathering with anti-conscriptionist delegates.<sup>69</sup>

Dafoe himself harboured doubts about the outcome of the convention. Though he realized that a large step toward a union government would be taken if the convention resolved in favour of a coalition, he thought that was too much to expect. One of the danger signals had been the Liberal Convention held in Toronto on July 20 which had expressed its full confidence in Laurier.<sup>70</sup> Dafoe thought that the most important problem was to see that the western Liberals were kept straight on the issue of winning the war.<sup>71</sup> He was greatly irritated when George P. Graham asked him to watch the convention carefully to prevent it from developing an anti-French line. In a burst of anger Dafoe retorted:

I hope most Westerners are as tired as I am of being told that we must not do this because Quebec would not like it, or that the party must do that because otherwise Quebec will rally to Bourassa. After one has been told twenty-five times in succession, as I was at Ottawa, that our national course on the war must be determined by the consideration that it is preferable that Laurier instead of Bourassa should control Quebec the dose becomes nauseating. I did for a while think this myself, but I now believe this is the wrong view.

Already, he continued, Bourassa controlled Laurier because of the latter's fear that he would lose the leadership of his people. Should

<sup>67</sup>Laurier Papers, Laurier to A. W. McLeod, July 31, 1917.

<sup>68</sup>*Ibid.*, A. W. McLeod to Laurier, July 27, 1917.

<sup>69</sup>Dafoe Papers, G. H. Barr to Dafoe, July 27, 1917.

<sup>70</sup>What appears to be an authentic account of the speeches delivered at this meeting was printed in the *Toronto Evening Telegram*, August 30, 1917, p. 16. A discussion of the genesis of this revealing document is found in Arthur R. Ford, *As The World Wags On* (Toronto, 1950), 94–5.

<sup>71</sup>Dafoe Papers, Dafoe to N. W. Rowell, July 25, 1917.



Laurier become premier again Bourassa would be the power behind the throne. Such a situation would be completely intolerable. Laurier, Dafoe judged, was now playing exclusively for the benefit of his people, claiming that if the English-Canadian Liberals suppressed their views, victory would be in the hands of the party. Laurier should have joined the coalition when Borden offered him the opportunity. He could have made his support conditional on the postponement of conscription until one last appeal for voluntary recruits was made by a national government. Had he taken this stand, Sir Wilfrid "would have closed his career secure in the confidence and affection certainly of the English Canadians, and I believe also of the better half of his own people."<sup>72</sup> Thus, for Dafoe, there was no longer any question of subordinating the issue of conscription to the exigencies of Liberal party unity.

But when the Western Liberal Convention met, Dafoe found himself in a minority with these strong views. Right from the outset it was clear that a majority of the delegates favoured continued support for Laurier and the Liberal party. On his arrival in Winnipeg at the outset of the convention, Main Johnson, who had gone West to watch the proceedings for N. W. Rowell, found Dafoe already convinced that the meeting was a Laurier gathering. After a conversation with Dafoe, Johnson, whose recently opened papers revealed a mine of information on the western meeting, made these important observations:

I believe the strength of opinion is against the Borden government rather than for Laurier, but this anti-Borden feeling, naturally enough, perhaps, is personified in his chief opponent, Laurier. There is no doubt at all of the intenseness of disgust with the present government. The delegates seem to think that to put them out is the immediate and chief patriotic duty to perform.

Dafoe pointed out the different, powerful sources from which Sir Wilfrid draws his power at the present time:—

1. The French people.
2. The Roman Catholic Church—French and English.
3. The C.P.R., the Bank of Montreal and probably the majority of the big interests.
4. The foreign vote.
5. The strong party Liberals who want to get into power and who see the chance now.

As an important factor, not fundamental, but a very proximate one, is the ill-timed visit of Sir Clifford Sifton. His unpopularity among the rank-and-file of Western Liberals seems to be unanimous, and he was here at about the time the delegates were being chosen.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>72</sup>*Ibid.*, Dafoe to George Graham, July 30, 1917.

<sup>73</sup>Toronto Public Library, Main Johnson Papers, Diary, Main Johnson to N. W. Rowell, Aug. 7, 1917.

Seeing these factors at work in the convention from the beginning, Dafoe apparently decided to try to salvage something from a desperate situation. Probably he worked through his friends, Premier Norris and A. B. Hudson, who led the Manitoba delegation. After many hours of labour in the Resolutions Committee, a compromise "Win-the-War" resolution, devised by Dafoe, was brought forward by Dr. D. B. Neely. It called for maximum war effort but eschewed any mention of conscription. Perhaps it was thought that such a resolution could be later interpreted as implying the necessity of both conscription and coalition. Unfortunately for those who hoped to profit from ambiguity, J. G. Turriff, a conscriptionist Liberal, remained unsatisfied and attempted to have the convention amend the motion to provide for compulsory military service if it became necessary. Not only was his effort a failure, but the debate revealed the sharp division within the western Liberal camp, and the strength of the anti-conscriptionist delegates.<sup>74</sup>

Having refused to support conscription, the convention turned to an enthusiastic and, by all reports, highly emotional endorsement of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's leadership. Nevertheless, Main Johnson felt that the resolution was only lukewarm, confining itself chiefly to Laurier's past record. Like the "Win-the-War" statement, it too was a compromise after a battle in the Resolutions Committee.<sup>75</sup> Thus on all major points, the convention turned thumbs down on the views that Dafoe had hoped to see accepted. As he later wrote, the meeting developed into "a bomb that went off in the hands of its makers."<sup>76</sup> Perhaps Dafoe accepted this result as substantiation of a rumour he had heard earlier of a bargain that had been struck between some western and Quebec Liberals: in return for western acceptance of Quebec's attitude to the war effort, French-Canadian Liberals would support western demands for tariff reform.<sup>77</sup> Certainly the convention was a serious defeat for the cause of Union government and conscription and a personal defeat for Dafoe and his newspaper, which had almost been openly condemned by the delegates.<sup>78</sup>

The machine politicians had won, the *Free Press* maintained. The West's true aspirations had been thwarted by a group of scheming politicians who cared little for the vigorous prosecution of the war.<sup>79</sup> But plans for a coalition government were not to be discarded so easily. Sifton, with his ardour little dampened by the set-back, proceeded to

<sup>74</sup>*Ibid.*, Main Johnson to N. W. Rowell, Aug. 9, 1917 (morning).

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.*, Aug. 9, 1917 (afternoon).

<sup>76</sup>Dafoe Papers, Dafoe to A. Bridle, June 14, 1921.

<sup>77</sup>Main Johnson Papers, Diary, Main Johnson to N. W. Rowell, Aug. 7, 1917.

<sup>78</sup>Laurier Papers, J. K. Barrett to Laurier, Aug. 9, 1917.

<sup>79</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, Aug. 10, 1917.



Ottawa leaving Dafoe to develop the western situation. It was well that Sifton had gone East, for Dafoe was aware that his business connections made him suspect in the West, and this unpopularity had contributed to the result of the Western Liberal Convention.<sup>80</sup> In Ottawa Sifton decided "to go in & fight it out to the finish."<sup>81</sup> For a month negotiations continued in the East with the important western leaders shuttling back and forth after being briefed by Dafoe. Dafoe's task was to persuade the westerners that the success of Union government depended upon their inclusion in it. He assured them that it was simply a war government in which no one would be expected to compromise his views on domestic policy.<sup>82</sup>

In mid-September the Borden government took a step which no doubt helped to convince the westerners that Union government was desirable. This step was the adoption of two new and unusual electoral laws, the Military Voters' Act and the Wartime Elections Act. The clauses of the latter Act which disfranchised "enemy aliens" were particularly important to the western politicians, for a large sector of their constituents was made up of these people. How much of a fillip this legislation gave to the Unionist cause is impossible to determine exactly; it certainly did not bring the protests from the West that some Unionists evidently expected.<sup>83</sup> By the first week in October the westerners were ready to throw in their lot with the coalition, and on October 12, the successful culmination of the months of critical negotiations was announced to the Canadian public.

The final act in the drama of Union government and the break-up of the Liberal party was the election which was called for December 17, 1917. For the first time since he had joined the *Free Press*, Dafoe and his newspaper were arrayed against the Liberals. Many of his life-long political friends were now his bitter foes. But Dafoe had decided months earlier that the issues of the war were far more important than political loyalties. He told his correspondent in Ottawa in October, 1917, that although he had no intention of making the *Free Press* an organ of the new government, he would give it strong independent support. No longer should Sir Wilfrid be represented as the gallant knight, for he had to be made to realize the "shameful mess" he had

<sup>80</sup>Dafoe Papers, Dafoe to Borden, Sept. 29, 1917. There is very wide agreement that Sifton's presence in Winnipeg worked to the advantage of the Laurier forces. See Main Johnson's letter quoted above; also, *Toronto Evening Telegram*, Aug. 7, 1917, p. 7; *Canadian Courier*, Aug. 25, 1917. A writer in the latter journal could hardly have emphasized the point more than when he wrote, "... the plain truth is that even 'Bob' Rogers has not one tenth of the number of bitter enemies among Western Liberals as has Sir Clifford Sifton."

<sup>81</sup>Dafoe Papers, Sifton to Dafoe, Aug. 14, 1917.

<sup>82</sup>*Ibid.*, Aug. 12, 1917 (Deciphered telegram).

<sup>83</sup>P.A.C., Rowell Papers, N. W. Rowell to F. Pardee, Sept. 19, 1917.

made of things. Dafoe's personal view was that it would be best for the old warrior to resign, for his continued leadership could only mean the ruin of the Liberal party by identifying it with an anti-war programme.<sup>84</sup>

Laurier, of course, persisted courageously in the course he believed was right despite the signs that the ground was crumbling under him. In Dafoe's view there were but two alternatives before the Canadian electorate and the correct one was obvious:

The choice is between the Government which represents, so far as the complex conditions of Canadian political life have made it possible for it to represent, every section of the community which is in favour of winning the war, and a party just as definitely pledged against the measures by which alone this Dominion's obligations and given word can be fulfilled, and which will be supported by all the elements opposed, from various motives, to the pursuit of an active war policy.<sup>85</sup>

In the heat of partisan strife, Dafoe identified the views of the Laurier Liberals with those of the Bourassa Nationalists, and misrepresented them both.<sup>86</sup>

The result was never in serious doubt. The Government, campaigning on the issue of conscription which was popular in English Canada, and with the assistance of its unusual electoral machinery, far outclassed the truncated Liberal party. At last on December 17 the unequal, but bitterly fought, winter campaign ended. The result showed the Laurier Liberals reduced to little more than a party of French Canadians, while the Unionist roster sagged under the weight of its enormous English-Canadian representation. Ignoring the country's serious racial division the *Free Press* proclaimed, "Canada was saved yesterday—from shame, from national humility, from treachery to her Allies, from treason to the holiest cause for which men have ever fought and died."<sup>87</sup>

Dafoe was not unaware of the critical situation caused by the racial rupture of the country. The day after the election he appealed to a French-Canadian friend to counsel the Quebec Liberals against any action that might increase the gravity of the condition. "I do not think," he concluded somewhat condescendingly, "the situation which is full of peril to Canada, can be changed except upon the initiative of Quebec herself."<sup>88</sup> His friend replied coldly that the crisis was the result of the fact that Dafoe himself, who understood Quebec and knew it was not disloyal, had "made racial appeals to the Anglo-

<sup>84</sup>Dafoe Papers, Dafoe to H. E. M. Chrisolm, Oct. 14, 1917.

<sup>85</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, Nov. 5, 1917.

<sup>86</sup>*Ibid.*, Dec. 7, 1917.

<sup>87</sup>*Ibid.*, Dec. 18, 1917.

<sup>88</sup>Dafoe Papers, Dafoe to Thomas Coté, Dec. 18, 1917.

Saxon element in the West against the Province of Quebec."<sup>89</sup> The charge was just. In his ardour to ensure the success of the war effort, a cause which Dafoe placed above all others, he had contributed his share to the grim disunity which faced Canadians at Christmas, 1917. But that disunity had not been created *ex nihilo* by conscription. Disunity is always a potential danger in Canada. The ugly sore of racial friction had been irritated by the years of debate over imperial policy and the naval question; the language controversy and the Lapointe resolution brought it to a head only to have it burst explosively by the conscription crisis. At each stage of this ulcerous development Dafoe had played his part. By 1917 he had reached the conclusion that the national interest was so critically at stake that, though racial disharmony might result, a greater cause had to be served, the cause of winning the war. He chose his side and fought for it passionately as an honest, though sometimes unfair, partisan.

As the New Year approached, the Canadian political scene was freer of confusion than it had been for many months. But this confusion had only been erased at the price of a bitter, though peaceful, political revolution. Dafoe, like many thousands of western Canadians, had cut the Gordian knot which for years past had tied him to the Liberal party. Why had this radical step been taken? Laurier offered a cryptic explanation when he wrote of Dafoe, "On many things he has the most advanced ideas of Liberalism and even Radicalism; on others his horizon is the horizon of the sixteenth century."<sup>90</sup> There was certainly truth in Laurier's temperate judgment. Since 1911, Dafoe had been growing increasingly uneasy about the conservatism of the Liberal party, especially on tariff policy. His sympathies were with the western farmer while Laurier, hoping to rebuild a national party, refused to accept the full measure of western demands, knowing that to do so would weaken his position in the more powerful, and more conservative, East.<sup>91</sup> Moreover Dafoe and Laurier disagreed completely on the French-language question. By characterizing him as "sixteenth century" Laurier meant that Dafoe was militantly Protestant in his attitude to the Roman Catholic Church. Certainly Dafoe had a Protestant's suspicion of "clerical influence" and an Anglo-Saxon's belief in the innate superiority of his culture over that of the French Canadians. He believed that with the exception of Quebec, Canada was an English-speaking nation. Therefore his genuine concern to reform the Manitoba school system, and his belief that outside Quebec the French Canadians were without legal language privileges, brought

<sup>89</sup>*Ibid.*, Thomas Coté to Dafoe, Dec. 27, 1917.

<sup>90</sup>Laurier Papers, Laurier to A. W. McLeod, Jan. 24, 1918.

<sup>91</sup>*Ibid.*, Laurier to E. W. Nesbitt, Dec. 23, 1910.

him into conflict with the French-Canadian Liberals. In theory he admitted an historic claim to special treatment for the French Canadians, but in practice he allowed almost none. His suspicions of the French Canadians, aroused by the Lapointe resolution, were further confirmed by Quebec's opposition to conscription and Union government.

But the source of the rupture between Dafoe and Laurier over conscription and Union government was deeper than the Liberal leader was prepared to recognize. It stemmed from a fundamental difference over the nature of the Great War and the role Canada should play in it. From the very outbreak of the conflict Dafoe had taken the view that it was Canada's war and that Canada's interests and aspirations were wagered upon its outcome. Of course, Canada was fighting on the side of Great Britain, but that was not because Canada was a colony, but because the interests of Canada and Great Britain in the cause of "freedom and democracy" were identical. Since it was Canada's war, Dafoe refused to accept any suggestion that limitations be placed on the extent of the country's participation. When voluntary recruiting proved incapable of producing the men necessary for a maximum war effort, Dafoe immediately agreed that compulsory military service would have to be put into practice. Union government was the best available means of achieving this end.

Laurier viewed the war as Britain's war and Canada's contribution to it as the assistance given by a colony to the mother country. This was the central theme of his speech on the declaration of war in the Canadian House of Commons on August 19, 1914: "More than once I have declared that if England were ever in danger—nay, not only in danger, but if she were ever engaged in such a contest as would put her strength to the test—then it would be the duty of Canada to assist the motherland to the utmost of Canada's ability."<sup>92</sup> Again and again the Liberal leader emphasized that Canada was entering the war because Britain was at war and "to ensure the defence of Canada and give what aid may be in our power to the Mother Country."<sup>93</sup> Canadians, he continued, "stood behind the Mother Country, conscious and proud that she was engaged in this war."<sup>94</sup> He made it clear that in his view the defence of Canada was the defence of Canadian territory.<sup>95</sup> Legally, he took the correct position expressed in the maxim, "When Britain is at war, Canada is at war." But since Canada was fighting for Britain, she would not be called upon to make the same sacrifice as the

<sup>92</sup>A. B. Keith, *Select Documents and Speeches on British Colonial Policy, 1763-1917* (Toronto, 1953), 360.

<sup>93</sup>*Ibid.*, 357.

<sup>94</sup>*Ibid.*, 358.

<sup>95</sup>*Ibid.*, 358-9.

principal participants. For Laurier that sacrifice fell just short of conscription. Searching for the cause of his disagreement with Laurier, Dafoe perceptively placed his finger on this crucial point. Characterizing Laurier's viewpoint, Dafoe wrote in his *Sifton*, "The war was England's; Canada was to assist; her assistance, humble as it might be, would be appreciated both for its material value and its moral help."<sup>96</sup> Here Dafoe was giving a telescoped paraphrase of Laurier's peroration. In words that must have stuck in the mind of the Conservative member for Portage la Prairie, Arthur Meighen, and caused Henri Bourassa to shudder, Laurier declared exultantly in August, 1914:

it is the opinion of the British Government, as disclosed by the correspondence which was brought down to us yesterday, that the assistance of our troops, humble as it may be, will be appreciated, either for its material value, or for the greater moral help which will be rendered. It will be seen by the world, that Canada, a daughter of old England, intends to stand by her in this great conflict. When the call goes out, our answer goes at once, and it goes in the classical language of the British answer to the call to duty: 'Ready, Aye Ready.'<sup>97</sup>

When the conscription issue was raised, Laurier, not for the first time, had more sober thoughts, though his conclusions were implicit in the attitude which he had taken toward the war from the outset. Certainly he had a multiplicity of reasons for opposing conscription—desire to preserve national unity, fear of the reaction in Quebec, doubts about the ability of the measure to produce the promised reinforcements, as well as his pledge to oppose it. But also there was the belief that Canada was engaged in the war not in her own interests, but merely to assist Britain. Describing Laurier's thoughts on conscription, O. D. Skelton wrote revealingly:

True Britain and the United States had adopted conscription, but they had entered the war as *principals*; it would undermine the whole basis of the Empire, destroy the whole basis of free and friendly *aid and sympathy* if compulsion were resorted to in a country which had gone in, *not for its own sake, but for Britain's*.<sup>98</sup>

Nothing was more indicative of Laurier's attitude than his belief that conscription and Union government were merely aspects of an imperialist plot to centralize the empire according to the plan of the Round Table.<sup>99</sup> Like every other scheme for imperial reorganization, this one had to be resisted.

Laurier's explanation of the reason for Canada's entry into the war was undoubtedly legally correct, and perhaps most Canadians would

<sup>96</sup>Dafoe, *Sifton*, 395.

<sup>97</sup>Keith, *Speeches and Documents*, 362-3.

<sup>98</sup>Skelton, *Laurier*, II, 508-9. My italics.

<sup>99</sup>Laurier Papers, Laurier to Sir Allen Aylesworth, May 15, 1917.

have agreed that Canada was at war to assist Britain. But Dafoe was not one of those Canadians. Regardless of legal technicalities, he believed that Canada was a nation, had entered the war because its interests were at stake, and had to employ every available means to protect them. As he wrote in August, 1917, "Canada is in the war as a principal, not a colony."<sup>100</sup> This had been his position since the day the *Free Press* had announced Canadian involvement in the war.

The nationalism of Dafoe and the nationalism of Laurier were at fundamental variance at this precise point. Dafoe viewed Canada, even in 1914, as part of a wider world in which she had international interests and responsibilities. Laurier saw Canada as isolated from the world and concerned, as far as possible, with her own trying problems. Dafoe's opposition to imperial centralization and the Round Table movement was as tenacious as Laurier's,<sup>101</sup> but whereas Laurier interpreted conscription and Union government as part of a Round Table plot, Dafoe considered them as the necessary means of promoting the national interest. Perhaps this explanation simply describes the gulf between English and French Canadians. But exactly the same conflict arose between Dafoe and Laurier's successor, the English Canadian, Mackenzie King. It arose because Dafoe believed that Canadian nationalism carried obligations as well as status; Laurier and King concentrated their attentions almost exclusively on status. For this reason Dafoe broke with Laurier in 1917, and was severely critical of King's external policy in the inter-war period. Perhaps some benefit might be derived from a fresh consideration of the Laurier-King interpretation of Canadian nationalism. Their interpretation of Canada's position and interest in world affairs is not the only valid one. Dafoe's interpretation was equally valid, and probably more realistic.

<sup>100</sup>*Manitoba Free Press*, Aug. 26, 1917.

<sup>101</sup>Dafoe Papers, Dafoe to G. M. Wrong, Oct. 16, 1916; *Manitoba Free Press*, Aug. 28, 1916. See Donnelly, M. S., "J. W. Dafoe and Lionel Curtis—Two Concepts of the Commonwealth," *Political Studies*, VIII, 2 (June, 1960), 170-82.

## Peter Mitchell on John A. Macdonald

A. L. BURT

ABOUT THIRTY-FIVE YEARS AGO my late friend the Hon. C. R. Mitchell of Edmonton lent me a typewritten letter signed in pencil by his uncle the Hon. Peter Mitchell of New Brunswick and addressed to A. F. Gault. Promising not to publish any of the contents without the permission of my friend, I was allowed to copy the letter and keep the carbon. I returned the document along with my ribbon copy so that my friend could collate them. Some time ago I wrote to his son, R. R. Mitchell, Q.C., of the C.P.R. Law Department in Winnipeg, saying that I thought the letter should be published. He replied that he "can see no objection to this being done." He also told me that he had an unsigned copy but did not know "where the original or any other signed copy may be." He has since searched in vain through the papers in his possession, and he recently lent me his unsigned copy. This I have collated with my carbon, and I find that whoever made the former dropped out a few words and phrases, which omissions, though of no importance, make it a less reliable copy than the latter. My carbon contains some obvious but inconsequential slips, which are the same as in the unsigned copy and may therefore have been made by Peter Mitchell or his typist. The letter is here reproduced from my carbon and is self-explanatory.

MONTREAL, OCT. 7th., 1893.

A. F. GAULT, ESQ.,  
MONTREAL.

MY DEAR SIR,—

I am in receipt of your letter marked "Private", of Sunday evening last, and have read it over and considered it very carefully, and I beg to say here at the beginning, that I accept it, in the spirit in which it was written, as coming from a sincere friend.



I believe what you say about your respect and friendship for myself, and I can assure you that respect and friendship, as you know, is fully reciprocated by me, and I have felt it to be a duty that I owe to myself, as well as to the continuation of your friendship with me, that I should enter at length into many causes which have created in my breast a feeling of hostility and antagonism to a man of the late Sir John A. Macdonald's character.

You say: "I have no doubt you consider you were very badly treated by the party you so bitterly and terribly denounced, but the man has now gone to his account. It would be much more noble, much more magnanimous on our part to allow the memory of him to rest beneath his tomb, and above all, as a Christian man, to forgive your enemies—to bless, and curse not. Take my advice and bury your grievances rather than upbraid the spirit of the man who has gone, and who you seem to think was your worst enemy. It is for your own sake I speak, or rather write, as I am doing. Everyone knows you have lots of brains, lots of ability, but I must say it does not become you, it is not worthy of your great talents to abuse and vilify any man, and especially one who has passed away and whose life is now judged by a power that never errs. Bottle up your talents and great abilities, and use them for your country's good, for your country's happiness and prosperity, leave self out of the question, then will you be revered and respected by all right thinking men. I now ask you, my dear Mr. Mitchell, to excuse this, perhaps you may think, piece of impertinence on my part—but as you must, I think know, I have a very kindly feeling for you, a very soft spot in my heart, and if I have offended you it is my regard for you that has caused me to say what I have said. The Good Book says, 'Faithful are the words of a friend'—I therefore pray you to excuse me if I have said anything amiss, and believe me always to remain,

"Yours very sincerely,  
"A. F. GAULT"

I may here say that there are few men whom writing me such a letter as yours, I would feel it worth while to notice—but coming from you, who I know have written in a friendly spirit, I again repeat that I feel it to be due to you, as well as to myself, to go at length into my personal experiences in the last twenty-nine years with the late Sir John A. Macdonald, as I am satisfied that you are in utter ignorance of many of the transactions, both public and private, which have effected my convictions.

Your reference to what might be for my own good by pursuing a policy of silence in respect to that gentleman, is doubtless very good advice, and perhaps might be pursued by men built in a different way from myself—and your kindly quotations from Scripture immediately bring to my memory some passages from the same Holy Book, of a different character, such as "An eye for an eye" and "A tooth for a tooth."

Your reference also to my speaking of the dead, and that I should let his memory rest, might be all very well if others did the same thing—but when I find gentlemen like yourself, who with that large generosity which has always characterized you, have subscribed generously to perpetuate and revive his memory in the public eye, by erecting monuments and setting forth his great merits, and placing him before the world as a gentleman of honor, truth and worthy of all admiration, I think it is rather yourself and gentlemen like yourself who are reviving and dealing with the memory of the dead—and if you have a right to do this, and in my opinion (by such kindly acts) mislead the public as



to the character of the man, I think that I, who hold a very different opinion of him, have an equal right to express my opinion and my estimation of his character, without being found fault with.

As to your complimentary remarks about my ability and brains, and your comments upon the use of them, we will let that pass for the present, and I will now proceed, as I stated before, to give you my personal experience of the deceased gentleman, upon which I base the conclusions of half a lifetime of his character, from close intercourse with him.

My first acquaintance with Sir John A. Macdonald was when we, in the Maritime Provinces, proceeded to Charlottetown to form a Maritime Union. On the day on which we opened our Confederation, Sir John A. Macdonald sailed into the port of Charlottetown, accompanied by a number of other distinguished Canadians, amongst whom were the late George Brown, Sir George E. Cartier, Sir Hector Langevin, Hon. Wm. McDougall, and a number of others—and asked to be heard before our Conference, which being granted, he proposed we should abandon the idea of the minor union of the Maritime Provinces, with a view of effecting a Confederation of the whole of British America, to which, after deliberation, the Conference acceded, and agreed to meet at Quebec in the following month of October, which we did. At that time the representative from New Foundland were also invited to attend at Quebec, and after many days' deliberation we agreed amongst other things that the two great parties of Liberals and Conservatives throughout the Dominion should sink party politics until Confederation was accomplished, and that when that was effected, both parties (should they so desire) were to be at liberty to resolve themselves into their original political elements. We agreed upon the terms on which Confederation should be accomplished, and made it the basis on which the British American act, which now forms the constitution of our country, should be based. It was then agreed that New Brunswick should be the first Province to test public opinion by an appeal to the people through a general election, and Mr. Tilley as Premier appealed to the people, and after thoroughly agitating the country, was, through a variety of unfortunate circumstances, defeated by a majority, speaking in round numbers, of about three to one, which practically ended all immediate prospects of Confederation, for without New Brunswick, lying as it does between Nova Scotia and Old Canada, it could not be effected.

I may here say that neither Nova Scotia nor Old Canada, in the face of the overwhelming defeat in New Brunswick, ever ventured to this day to test their Provinces by a verdict of the people upon that question.

I was then a member of Mr. Tilley's Cabinet, and aided him to the best of my ability to obtain a favorable verdict—but having failed, we were compelled to resign and make way for a cabinet of Anti-Confederates, headed by Mr. Albert Smith, who was the Premier of the new Government. I at the time, as I think still, thought that with proper management we never ought to have failed, and believe the one chief cause of our failure was an injunction placed upon us of New Brunswick at the Quebec Conference that we were not to make public the conclusions of the Conference until all the delegates had arrived at their several Provinces and had reported at headquarters, and in consequence of that silence the suspicions of the press and the people of our Provinces were excited and the tide turned against us and we were beaten. In bidding adieu to the Governor of that day, the Hon. Arthur H. Gordon, Uncle of our respected Governor-General, the Earl of Aberdeen, I told him my opinion upon that subject, and I ventured a prediction that twelve months would not elapse before he would find that such a

change in public opinion would occur as would warrant him in the belief that my prediction was correct and with another opportunity would be verified.

I need not go into the various details of Mr. Smith's administration. All the leaders of the Conservative party, including Tilley and Fisher, were defeated, and I alone, of the previous Government, had a seat in the Legislature and that only in the Legislative Council, and we had no one in the Legislative Assembly who had ever made a five minutes' speech or had ever taken a prominent part in the Government of our country to explain or defend our views. Mr. Gordon was sent for to England, and it was known there that he was not so partial to the larger Confederation as he was to the conception of the smaller one, and when he returned to our Province, although I was not in his Cabinet, he sent for me to come over to Fredericton to consult with him as to the condition of affairs, when he informed me of the strong wishes that prevailed amongst the British Government to carry Confederation, and asked me if I would support Smith, who he said he believed could be persuaded to agree to certain terms of union and wished me to take a seat in Mr. Smith's Government, who he said was anxious for it. I told him that I could not do that, nor did I see how Mr. Smith, having been elected by the people only some six or seven months before by an overwhelming majority against it, could turn around and adopt it. I said, while I would not go into his Government, I would undertake on behalf of the party I represented (as I was more of a patriot than a politician or partisan,) to induce our party to support Mr. Smith in that measure if he was sincere—which I told the Governor I doubted—although by so doing we would forego all the advantages of the immense patronage which the first Government of Confederation would have at the disposal of New Brunswick. I met Mr. Smith, by appointment with the Governor, at Government House, and discussed the matter, and while by inference Mr. Smith would seem to coincide with the statements the Governor had made, I had grave doubts in my own mind about his sincerity. When the Legislature met some few weeks after, the Governor sent for me to renew my assurances of support to Mr. Smith, which I did—but insisted that as a guarantee against Mr. Smith going back against us, he must have a paragraph inserted in the "Queen's Speech" approving of Confederation. To this Mr. Smith objected, though still professing his intention to carry it. I was firm about it and gave my reasons so strongly that though His Excellency believed in Mr. Smith's sincerity—which I doubted—he at last insisted and the paragraph was put in. The result of it was, as I clearly foresaw, that Mr. Smith's supporters would be surprised at such a declaration and in all probability refuse to vote for it, which they did.

In all the steps that I took, I was in close concert with both Mr. Tilley and Mr. Fisher, who had no seats in the Parliament at the time—and as I foresaw the trouble that Mr. Smith would get into, I had an arrangement with Mr. Tilley that when the time came and the crisis arose, he would accept the Premiership and make another appeal to the people—but to my surprise, the night before the crisis was expected and came, he backed out, stating that he had already appealed to the people in nine months and been beaten; if he did it again and was beaten, as he believed he would be, the people would say he was a fool—so there was nothing left for me but to accept it myself, and I did, and Mr. Tilley seconded me ably and well. I believed we would succeed—I told him so, and we did succeed—and after going to the country on the very same issue on which our Government was defeated nine months before, I came back with a majority behind me of nearly four to one—and thus was the most active and

principal means of carrying Confederation, Mr. Tilley being my Secretary, Mr. Fisher my Attorney-General, and other gentlemen holding minor offices. We then passed the official resolutions embodying the conditions of the Union.

Nova Scotia and Canada, as I have stated, never did appeal to the people—they both came in by votes of their Legislatures. In Old Canada it was very easy, because both Liberals and Conservatives were in favor of them—In Nova Scotia it was a more difficult matter—the majority of the Legislature was against Confederation in that Province, but by some mysterious means, three of the majority were won over and voted for the Confederate party, and Nova Scotia also came in by resolution of their Parliament. It then became necessary for each of the Provinces to send delegations to England to get an act passed through the British Parliament, confirming the acts of the Provinces, and the time for departure was fixed for the end of June of that year, 1866. The Nova Scotians and New Brunswickers left on that mission, and while waiting for the steamer at *Riviers de Loup*, and Mr. Tilley waiting at Halifax for the *Cunard* steamer, we received telegrams from Ottawa that we would have to go home, as the Canadians would not leave until November—but both Mr. Tilley and myself agreed that if we went back it would be an end to Confederation, and that we had better go on. The causes of this change of arrangement were due to Sir John A. Macdonald's condition and habits at the time—were of immense inconvenience to the delegates of the other Provinces, and in fact imperilled the whole future of Confederation. We waited in England till December, I think, before they arrived, and lost the chance of putting our act through the British Parliament during the summer session, as we had expected to have done, and did not get it through till the winter session of March, after the Canadians arrived. After a good deal of deliberation the Conference in London agreed upon the final details of the bill, after a great many differences of opinion on school questions, railway matters, and a host of other important things. About the end of April (I am speaking of these dates from memory and do not therefore say they are quite correct,) our Legislature in New Brunswick being convened, they confirmed the act of the British Parliament, which is now the constitution of the country.

I will now come to the first act of Sir John Macdonald's, of a personal character, of which I have reason to complain. As the first of July approached, being the period fixed for the organization of the constitution at Ottawa, I naturally expected to have heard from him as the Premier of the Province—but in place of that he sent to my subordinate, Mr. Tilley, instructions for him to come to Ottawa and bring such member of his Cabinet with him as he chose, to go into the Government at Ottawa, which was a direct personal slight to me as the Premier of the Province. I naturally resented that and wrote to Sir John Macdonald, telling him that if it was not for one thing I would resent it—but that inasmuch as I knew that the great question so far as the Province was concerned would be the route and location of the Intercolonial Railway, and that in my canvass for Confederation through the northern part of the Province, I was pledged to the neck to do the best I could to support the northern route, and if I failed to go we would lose the route. Mr. Tilley knew the difficulty, he being pledged to the southern route and I to the northern, and he would have much preferred a River St John man to myself, and I believe intended to take him. We had some very angry words over it, but my force of character settled the matter. I received an apologetic letter from Sir John Macdonald for overlooking me—swallowed the insult in the interests of my country, and went to Ottawa and

joined the Government. Sir John informed me that he had apportioned all the offices except two, viz: Secretary of State for the Provinces, and Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in connection with neither of which was there any work to be done (as he said,) and advised me to take the former, which I declined, as I accepted the latter—and I think I proved to the public that there was a great deal of work and that I did it. Of course it may have been the political exigencies of the case that induced Sir John Macdonald to give away all the offices of influence without consulting me, and to reserve to me the choice of two in which he himself admitted there was nothing to be done.

A few weeks after this Sir John Macdonald came to me and stated that there were six C.B.'s to be conferred upon leading men connected with Confederation; two for Quebec, two for Ontario, and one each for New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. He said to me that I as Premier of my Province was entitled to the New Brunswick one, but he would take it as a favor if I would let him offer it to Mr. Tilley, and that an early opportunity would occur of my getting one also. I told him he could give it to Mr. Tilley—but that was the last that I ever heard of Sir John Macdonald attempting to fill his promise to myself. It is true that in later years Sir John Macdonald in Parliament, and also at a public dinner in the City of Montreal, stated in reference to Sir Albert Smith and his receipt of honors in connection with the Halifax award, that another man had obtained honors and titles that Mr. Mitchell had earned. In reply from my seat in the House, I thanked the right honorable gentleman for his tardy recognition of my claims—but I stated that years had elapsed since that time and that he, Sir John Macdonald, had been scattering honors on the right hand and on the left—but he forgot Peter Mitchell. As time passed on I satisfied Sir John and the country by my public services in connection with the Department that there was much to be done in the way of strengthening the Government through that Department.

The term of the first five years of the Parliament was drawing to a close, and it became necessary for the Government to look over the ground and arrange, as is generally done, for the candidates for the different constituencies. When they reached Northumberland, which had been captured from us in a by-election two years before, Sir John said "Well, Mitchell, who have you got to recapture the county?" I replied, "There is no one in the country that can defeat the sitting member, unless I resign my seat in the Senate and go down and contest it myself." He said, "In that case I think it is your duty to do so," and I stated that if it was his decision I would do it, and I did it and was returned by acclamation.

We will now come to the spring of 1873, when the late Mr. Huntingdon brought his first charges against Sir John Macdonald of obtaining money from the late Sir Hugh Allan in connection with the Pacific scandal, in which Mr. Huntingdon failed to carry his resolution in the House. At this time Prince Edward Island had come into the Confederation and the arrangement made that the Quebec Conference, by which different parties should have the liberty of resolving themselves into their original political elements, had arrived. At a meeting of Council immediately after the prorogation of the House, I informed Sir John Macdonald that as Confederation was accomplished, I intended to resign for the reason that he had not carried out in good faith the arrangement that he made at the Quebec Conference, by which he agreed that an equal number of Liberals and Conservatives should be represented in that body as had been done seven years before when the Confederation was first formed—that

when on the death of Mr. Ferguson Blair, a Liberal, his successor was a Conservative—that he at different times appointed the Hon. Wm. McDougall, the Hon. Adams Archibald, and the Hon. Wm. Howland, all three Liberals, to governorships in the different Provinces—that at this time Mr. Tilley, who desired to go to England and was going to effect a loan, had practically the governorship of New Brunswick in his pocket, and that I was really the sole Liberal left in the Cabinet, and that I thought it a breach of the contract which had been made between the two political parties, and that as I did not intend to change my politics, but to remain with the party with which I had been associated all my life, I would retire from the Cabinet and make place for somebody else. Sir John, as well as several of my other colleagues, urged me very strongly to remain—but I refused to do so. Sir John then said, "Mitchell, do you want to embarrass me?" I said, "Certainly not, Sir John, I am doing it as a matter of principle, not for the purpose of embarrassing you." Then he said, "In that case I will ask you to remain until after recess is over, and if you are still of the same mind, I will accept your resignation." I assented—we all went to take our recess in the country, and while having mine and endeavoring to amuse myself by killing a salmon on the banks of the Nipisigait River, I received the startling announcement which appeared at that time in the "Montreal Gazette," declaring against Sir John Macdonald and exposing the whole particulars of the so-called Pacific scandal, after the robbery of Sir Hugh Allan's papers from Mr. John Abbott's office. I started immediately for Ottawa, and although it had been settled that I was to quit the Government on my return, and I was perhaps the only member of his Cabinet that could have left them with honor, because it had been settled as I have stated, I never hinted at such a thing—but when the ship commenced drifting on to the rocks, I took off my coat and tried to "club-haul" her off the rocks, for which Sir John Macdonald repeatedly thanked me personally for which he was pleased to call my "generous support of him." The circumstances connected with that period are no doubt in your mind. Representations were made which compelled Lord Dufferin, the then Governor-General, in the performance of which he considered his duty, to call a Session of Parliament for the purpose of inquiring into the charges which were made against Sir John Macdonald, the results of which session the public are well acquainted with. When the session commenced and the charges were formulated by the late Alexander Mackenzie, we in the Cabinet, as well as the supporters of the Government in the House, naturally expected that Sir John Macdonald would have at once got up and replied to the very serious charges which were brought against him—but in place of that he put up Mr. James Macdonald, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, to defend him, and though he did the best in his power with the information he possessed, it was evident to every thinking man that it was only Sir John Macdonald who could make the defense. I may here state that the only information I possessed in relation to that pacific scandal was what I received through the press, by the publications in the newspapers of the stolen papers and the criticisms upon them, as Sir John Macdonald never gave to his colleagues in Council, so far as I know, any explanation, nor did he attempt to deny or justify himself from the charges which were brought against him, and he left us his colleagues in utter ignorance of whether they were true or false, nor did he ever give me any explanation of these transactions up to the day of his death—but his colleagues, including myself, stuck to him in every way that we could to tide him through his difficulty. I several times remarked to my colleagues on the failure of Sir John to get up in the House and defend

himself but the answer of such ardent supporters to me on one of these occasions was that "Sir John was the best judge of when he should do that." The debate went on, lasting for many days, the exact time I do not now recollect (as I am writing this entirely from memory, without reference to the records which are not within my reach,) and Sir John put up supporter after supporter to reply to the speeches made against him by the other side, until he had exhausted almost all the supporters who sat behind him who had ever made a five minutes' speech in the House. The time at last arrived when he could no longer defer his speaking himself, and he was listened to with a great deal of attention—he spoke for about five hours, in a mumbling, rambling, desultory kind of speech, if you could call it a speech. I sat at his left hand. Before he commenced, he said to me, "Mitchell, I am not very strong and I will require some little stimulant—I wish you would see that I have some gin and water sent to me from time to time." Lady Macdonald sat at the right of the speaker's chair, within speaking distance of myself, during the whole period of the speech. I got him at different times, at his request, three different glasses of gin, and I noticed in the progress of it that he was getting what seemed to me to be the worse of liquor, and the fourth glass he asked for I told the boy only to bring half a glass and fill the tumbler up with water. When he tasted it, he turned around and said, "Mitchell, too weak, too weak, get me some more." I leaned over towards Lady Macdonald, told her of Sir John's request, calling her attention to his apparent condition, and asked her if I should do what he asked. After hesitating half a minute, she said, "I suppose you will have to give it to him if he desires it." It was a matter of surprise to me that the small amount that I had supplied to him should have had the effect upon him that it apparently had, and it was not until after the debate was over, when two of his particular supporters, both devoted admirers, were talking over Sir John's condition during his speech, which was apparent to everybody, that I discovered that the same thing that he had requested me to do, he had also requested two others, none of us knowing that the other had been furnishing it. I saw other messenger boys bringing what I thought tumblers of water, but it appears they were tumblers of gin and water, which each of these other two gentlemen were supplying in the same way that I was myself. The mental excitement under which a gentleman in such a position as Sir John Macdonald's would naturally enable him to stand almost any amount of liquor, and hence the fact that notwithstanding three of us were supplying it unknown to the other, he was enabled to keep upon his legs.

Sir John during the whole of the session has been drinking very heavily. Some days after he had delivered the speech he said to me "Mitchell, I think it is time you made a speech." I said, "Sir John, I am not going to make a speech," and I didn't, "you have never explained the transaction to me nor attempted to justify yourself, and I am not going blindly to deal with a matter I know nothing about. I have stuck to you and worked for you throughout this whole affair, notwithstanding the arrangement made in May last that I was to quit your Cabinet—but make a speech I will not." During the balance of the session Sir John Macdonald was scarcely sober at any time that I saw him. The time came when our nominal majority was reduced to six in the House, and it became rumored that Mr. Donald A. Smith was going to make a speech against Sir John, and it was believed that after his speech even our nominal majority would disappear. Mr. Smith's speech was fixed for three o'clock in the afternoon. About two o'clock Sir Charles Tupper and the Hon. Mr. Campbell, two of our colleagues, came to me and asked me if I would not see Mr. Smith, with whom I was



personally very friendly, and then see Sir John Macdonald and arrange for a meeting between them, with a view of reconciling their differences. I answered them, "You are far more important members of the Cabinet than I am, why don't you go and see them yourselves?" "Well," said Sir Charles Tupper, "you know, Mitchell, from experience in Council that Sir John Macdonald will stand from you what he won't stand from either of us, and we thought it better that you should see Sir John and at the same time see Mr. Smith and arrange for the meeting." I knew that to be true, and said, "I will do it." I went and saw Mr. Smith, who was just waiting for the speaker to take the chair to commence his speech. I told him what my mission was. He said to me, "Mr. Mitchell, I don't desire to defeat your Government, but Sir John has acted in such a shameful way to me that I will put up with it no longer, and if he desires to make amends for it, if you arrange the interview, I will meet him." Mr. Smith put off his speech till the evening session of the House at eight o'clock. I went to Sir John Macdonald's room, No. 5 Parliament Buildings, about half-past two, and found him lying on the sofa in a state of intoxication. I said to him, "Sir John, your colleagues have requested me to come to you, to arrange for a meeting between you and Mr. Smith, to see if you cannot settle your differences, and he has agreed to put off his speech till the evening session for that purpose." His only answer to me was, with a half broken utterance, "Damned scoundrell Damned scoundrell!" and he turned over with his face to the wall to go to sleep again. I said, "Sir John, he may be all that you say, but I think, from the manner in which your supporters have stood by you throughout your troubles, that something is due to them on your part, and that you ought to see Mr. Smith." In reply to that he said, "Come to-morrow." I answered him, "To-morrow you won't be a minister." He then said, "Give me a couple of hours," which I thought the only sensible remark he had made since I had entered his room. I then went and arranged for a meeting with Mr. Smith at half-past five, and at that time accompanied Mr. Smith to Sir John's room, and jocularly said to Sir John, "Here is an old friend who has come to see you, and I hope you will reconcile your differences," and left them, and waited very anxiously in the lobby until Mr. Smith came out, which was in about twenty minutes, when I saw by the expression and color of his face that he was very much excited and I feared it was all up with us. Mr. Smith came along to where I stood and said to me, "Mitchell, he's an awful man that, he's done nothing but curse and swear at me since I went into the room." Mr. Smith said, "I did not want to vote against your Government, and particularly on your account, Mr. Mitchell, because you have always treated me very fairly—but there is nothing else for me to do, and I will have to do it." I then went and communicated the facts to my colleagues. The result of Mr. Smith's speech that evening is a matter of history, and it was apparent to every member of the Cabinet, as well as to those who sat behind them, that the Government was gone, and Sir Hector Langevin, as the acting leader of the Government, rose in his place and asked for an adjournment of the House, with a view of allowing the Government to consider their position. We at once agreed that there was nothing but resignation before us and it was better to resign before an adverse vote was taken, which would have compromised the gentlemen in support of us. We appointed a meeting of Council for nine o'clock the next morning, and sent notice to Sir John Macdonald. Ten o'clock came, no appearance of Sir John—Half-past ten, no Sir John, and we requested the Hon. John Henry Pope to drive down to his house and bring him up. He came back in about twenty minutes and reported that he found Sir John in bed, reading a

novel. In about half an hour afterwards he came to Council and we announced our decision. The only remark he made was, "I suppose I will have to go to Rideau Hall and hand in your resignations," and that was all Sir John had to do with that transaction.

A meeting of the friends and supporters of the late Government was called two days after, at which one hundred and five Senators and Commoners put in an appearance, the object being to choose a leader, when either Sir Alexander Campbell proposed and Sir Charles Tupper seconded, or vice versa, that Sir John Macdonald be the leader of the opposition, and the meeting seemed to be unanimous all but myself, when I got up and stated that my obligations to Sir John Macdonald under the Quebec arrangement had ceased last spring and that in May last I had given him notice of my intention to quit the Government for the reasons previously stated, and that in order that they might make the thing unanimous, I would step out of the room. I was urged to change my mind, but I firmly resolved never to follow a man as leader with habits such as Sir John Macdonald had. I informed the meeting at the same time that I was not going to support Mr. Mackenzie that in future, till some other more feasible course was opened, I would play from my own hand and be my own leader, which I have been since that date. After the meeting, Sir John Macdonald came to me to tell me that a banquet was going to be given to the members of the late Government, and asked me as a favor to go to it. I told him I thought it would be unwise for me to do so, that someone would make some remark at the banquet in consequence of my refusal to accept him as a leader, and if they did it might lead to a disturbance, as I would not tolerate any criticisms on my course from anybody. Sir John said that he would take care that nothing of the kind would be said or done, and hence I attended the banquet, which was my last association in a formal way with Sir John Macdonald.

I will now come to the period of Mr. Mackenzie's five years of administration, and can safely state that no man in that House gave him a more determined opposition than I did, and one incident was sufficiently illustrated when I referred to the case of Widow Murphy's cow. I practically led the opposition during Mackenzie's five years of administration, as neither Sir Charles Tupper nor Sir John Macdonald gave very constant attention to it, except on very important occasions, and I was almost always there. The fifth year of Mr. Mackenzie's term approached and Sir John Macdonald, as leader of the opposition, began stumping the country and announced a new policy of protection, which he called "The National Policy." Sir John Macdonald had been all his life a Free Trader up to that time. On a visit to Montreal he sent for me. I met him in the Windsor Hotel, and he said to me, "Mitchell, I know that I have no claims on you. I have started, as you see, a new policy. I know that you are not in accord with Mr. Mackenzie, and I want you to join our party." I said, "Sir John, I will join no party, but if your policy is satisfactory I will support it. What is your 'National Policy.' Do you intend to put any duty on the food of the people, such as pork, beef, flour, corn meal, oat meal, corn, etc., etc.? because if you do, I will not support you, and for this reason, 'That the lumbermen, fishermen, and the followers of other industries are purchasers and consumers of these articles,' and I can't support any policy that will increase the duty upon these goods." His answer to me was, "No, I do not." I said, "So far, that is right. Now what is your maximum duty on manufactured goods?" His answer to me was, "Twenty-five per cent." I said, "That is all right, I'll support you." I said, "Can I rely upon that? We are going to have an election within three or four weeks and I will have to



make these statements in public." He said, "You can," and after some further desultory conversation, we separated, and I did not see him again until after the election. During the progress of my canvass in the county, I heard some rumors that Sir John Macdonald was going to impose a duty on flour—but as these statements came chiefly from the supporters of my opponent, Mr. Snowball, I thought they were mere election dodgers and paid little heed to them, and in the first three meetings I held I denounced them as fabrications and lies. During the progress of the third meeting, while I was speaking, Mr. Snowball got up and asked me if I would give him a few minutes to read the speech of Sir John Macdonald's at Goderich, Ontario, in which Sir John announced his intention of putting a duty of 50 cents on flour, 30 on corn meal and oat meal, and heavy duties on beef, pork, etc., when some one in the crowd called out, "You're the liar, not the persons who have stated that Sir John Macdonald was going to impose these duties!" The result of it was, I lost my election by a small majority, as was very natural, the lumbermen and fishermen turned against me when they found they were going to pay heavy duties on the food they required for the prosecution of their business. As was natural, when I met Sir John Macdonald on my return to Montreal, at the Windsor Hotel, I upbraided him with his treachery and deceit for placing me in such a false position as he did as to his policy. He clapped me on the shoulder and tried to appease my indignation with that knowledge and tact which he so strongly exercised over men. He said, "I couldn't help it, I was sincere when I told you what I did, but I found the milling interests so strong that when I got out in the west I had to concede the duty on flour, and the other articles had necessarily to follow." I said to him, "Why didn't you inform me of your change of policy, and not have placed me in the position to be denounced as a liar before my constituents?" He said, "I forgot all about it." After a little further conversation, when I became somewhat mollified, he said to me, "We'll make it up with you, old boy, I'll give you the governorship of New Brunswick—Mr. Chandler, the present Governor, is only keeping the place warm, and will resign whenever I ask him." I said, "Sir John, I don't want the governorship, I am going to wipe out my defeat at the very first chance I get—but I'm a poor man, have spent a great deal of money in political affairs and am going to endeavor to attend to my own affairs and in many ways you can serve me if you feel inclined." Said he, "Anything under God's heavens that I can do to promote your interests, I will do," and again I believed him.

Four years passed over and during that period, while I never would have taken any office of emolument from the Government, there were numerous opportunities in which Sir John Macdonald could have served me—some of these I may have occasion to refer to before I get through—but my experience of him was that while promising to support me, in every single case he did exactly the contrary. I will here mention one circumstance. After Mackenzie was out, Mr. Frederick Perry came to me and said, "Mitchell, this is an unfortunate thing for me, that Mackenzie has been beaten, because he had resolved to establish a policy of insuring the Government buildings and property, and has actually got the report and most of them made out, and he promised me the agency for the Province of Quebec. Of course he says I cannot get it now, but I thought I would mention it to you, so that you could speak to Sir John Macdonald and get it for yourself." I did so within four or five days subsequent to the last conversation I have referred to with Sir John. I told him what had been stated to me, and he said, "Just the thing for you, old fellow, I'll fix it for you." But several months elapsed and nothing was done about it, though I saw Sir John two or three times

and reminded him of it. When Parliament met and the "Queen's Speech" was issued, to my intense surprise I saw a paragraph in the "Speech" announcing that the Government was going to adopt a policy of life insurance. I inferred at once that if they were going to adopt the policy of insuring other people's lives, they couldn't adopt the policy consistently of effecting insurance upon their own property. I at once went to Ottawa to see Sir John about the property insurance. He turned around to me and said, "Mitchell, I am very sorry," taking up the "Queen's Speech" and pointing to the paragraph in relation to life insurance, "it would not be consistent for us to adopt the policy of insuring our property against fire, while we ourselves are establishing the policy of life insurance." I said, "Why did you do it, Sir John?" "Oh," he said, "the Government did it." I said, "Sir John, you're the Government and could have prevented it if you liked, and I consider you have broken faith with me." He denied that and said he could not help it. There never was the slightest reference made to that paragraph in Parliament that session, except when it was read over with the other portions of the speech by the clerk of the House, and it became evident to me that it was inserted only for the purpose of affording him an argument for refusing me what he had promised.

For the next two years several projects, which would have been of benefit to the country, as well as to myself, were submitted to him for his approval, and as far as words went and promises I got his approval—but in every solitary case I found him working against me—I saw that he had some feeling of animosity against me, and I made up my mind to abandon all efforts to accomplish anything that he could possibly defeat.

The last year of the term of that House, which only lasted four years, I was lunching with the late John Henry Pope in the Rideau Club at Ottawa, and after lunch while smoking my cigar with Mr. Pope, Sir John Macdonald came into the Club on his way to Council, and slapping me on the shoulder, said, "Well, old Mitchell, how are you?" I said, "Very well, Sir John." He said, "Have a glass of wine with me?" I said, "No thank you, I have had some wine with Mr. Pope at lunch, and don't feel inclined to take any more." "You won't refuse to drink with me?" said he. "Oh," I said, "if you put it on that footing, I won't refuse to drink with you." He went out to order the wine and I was gradually approaching the condition of belief that Sir John Macdonald was utterly insincere and untrustworthy, and when he came in I turned around to him and said, "Sir John, you are very ready offering me what I don't want—you're not so ready to give me what I do want." Said he, "What do you mean, old chap, Assurance?" I said, "Yes." He says, "I'll do it this very afternoon for you; I'm just going to Council now," and he walked out of the room to the head of the stairs and came back and said, "Oh, by the way, Mitchell, I'm afraid I can't do it this afternoon, as it will require a report from the Minister." Said I "Sir John, you have had that report in your drawer for the last three years." "Oh then," said he, "that's all right, I'll do it this afternoon." When he left I said to Pope, "Pope, will you see that that report is hunted up and placed before him?" He said, "I will, Peter." Just then Sir Hector Langevin, who was the Minister who made the report, was passing from the west block to the east, and I said to Mr. Pope, "There's Mr. Langevin going to Council, I'll write a note to him, telling him what Sir John has said," which I did, handed the note to Mr. Pope, who subsequently told me that he gave it to Mr. Langevin who hunted up the report, placed it before Sir John with my note, which report Sir John took up and threw on one side. Before Council closed, Pope went over to Sir John, took up the

report, and handing it to him said, "Sir John, you promised Mitchell to put this report through, and you had better do it." He threw it on one side again, saying, "That can stand." When I received the information that same evening from both Mr. Pope and Mr. Langevin, I made up my mind that it was the last transaction in which I would place any reliance in the word of Sir John Macdonald, as I could clearly see that he had some animosity against me and was only fooling me, and I adhered to that resolution to the day of his death, when had I not had that conviction things might have been very different both for him and myself, for after I was re-elected before the late Thomas White was sworn in, he (Mr. White) came to me, as he informed me it was Sir John Macdonald's request, to say that he was going to be taken into the Cabinet and that Sir John wished to take me in at the same time. I told Mr. White to tell Sir John Macdonald not to offer me a seat in the Cabinet, for I would refuse it—and I further said that had I ceased to have any confidence whatever in Sir John Macdonald and I would not be responsible for any of his acts. A day or two after Sir Hector Langevin came to me and urged me to consent. I told him, as I told Mr. White, to tell Sir John Macdonald not to offer me a seat, for I would refuse it, and the refusal would embarrass him as it would also embarrass me with my constituents—and Sir John never did offer it to me.

Another instance of his insincerity occurred in relation to a timber limit, which in conjunction with another party we applied for on Jack-Fish River, flowing into Lake Winnipeg. We applied in the month of March. There were two other applicants on the same river, but not on the same piece of ground, ahead of us—the Deputy told me at the time of application that there were no surveys made on that section of the country, and that before he could grant my application, it would be necessary for us to make a survey in order to obtain the metes and bounds—but that as soon as we had furnished that, we would get it. The two others ahead of us were in the same position as we were, but they made no survey. My friend and I went on and made the survey, which involved chaining a distance of several hundred miles—it took us a whole summer to do it, and cost us three thousand dollars, and we did not get the returns till the end of October. When I received them I went to Ottawa, saw the Deputy Minister and told him that I had made the survey, but I learned that the two parties who were ahead of us on that river for other grounds, were waiting for our survey in order to get their applications located, and I for some time declined to give our report until I could get an assurance of Sir John Macdonald that I would get the limit applied for, and besides that I did not think it was fair of the other two parties that we should furnish the whole expense for obtaining the necessary information—In addition to that I discovered that subsequent to the time of our application there were eleven other applications for grounds on the same river. When I was assured by Sir John that the applications would be granted in the order in which they were applied for, I handed in the result of our survey, and waited several weeks for the application to be granted. When I again went to Ottawa I discovered that the Department, as I was informed, under the instructions of Sir John Macdonald, had granted the two first applications, passed over ours, and went down to the eleventh on the list and granted the lot we had applied for to a party whose application had only been put in in the month of October; and the money that my friend and myself had expended so far as we were concerned, was thrown away, except so far as it inured to the benefit of the other three applicants and the Department itself. I went to Sir John Macdonald and complained of the unfair treatment that I had received; and he

stated that he could not have avoided it; that the party to whom he gave it was a very strong partisan of his in Ontario, and pressed him so hard that he had to give way—at the same time he admitted the injustice of which we had been the victims. He said to me, however, "Make an application in any other place and I will grant it to you." I saw my friend, told him what had taken place, and he very shortly after furnished me with the particulars of another application on the Lake-of-the-Woods, which I showed to Sir John Macdonald, who told me to take it to the Deputy, which I did. The Deputy said, "Mr. Mitchell, that application is within the limits of the disputed territory claimed by Ontario. I will have to call Sir John Macdonald's attention to it," which he did. When I again saw Sir John and referred to that fact, he stated, "I will give you the limit, Mitchell, I am determined to take the bull by the horns so far as Mowatt is concerned, and take possession of the territory—Go to Mr. McPherson, who is acting for me in the Department of the Interior, and tell him to take the necessary steps to grant your application." I went to Mr. McPherson and told him so, and I suppose, as near as I can recollect, I went fifteen to twenty times to him and Sir John, and was always put off with the assurance that it would be done right away. The Session of the Legislature which was then sitting arose, however, and nothing had been done in my matter, and I naturally felt very indignant after having waited till the month of June, having failed in all my efforts for the previous four or five months. I wrote Sir John Macdonald, who had gone to Riviere de Loup, a letter setting forth the treatment that I had received and complaining of his breach of faith in keeping his promises with me. I was going for my health to the Southern States, being very ill at the time, and just as I was leaving to go to the train, my office boy handed me a letter, which I saw was in the handwriting of Sir John, and on opening it I discovered that it was in answer to my letter written him some weeks before, in which he acknowledged the fact that I had been badly used and said that he had given instructions to the Deputy Minister of the Interior to grant me the limit right away, and hoped that I would overlook the neglect and delay. I was just about starting off on the train when I handed a letter to Mr. Duncan McIntyre, who had accompanied me to the depot, asking him to hand it to Hon. Mr. Pope and say to him that I would feel obliged if he would go to the Department of the Interior for me and have the matter put through, which he afterwards informed me he did. On my return some eleven or twelve weeks afterwards, I met Mr. Pope in the Windsor Hotel, who told me that he had taken that letter, handed it to the Deputy Minister and requested him to carry out Sir John Macdonald's instructions, and that he said he would do so; and he expressed him surprise that I had not heard from the Deputy on the subject. I went to Ottawa with Mr. Pope the next day, expecting to get the matter put through. When I called on the Deputy he was just going out, he said, to call on Sir John Macdonald—I told him what I came for, asked him if he had got Sir John's letter. He said he had. He said, "I know all about it—I was present when he wrote it to you." I then said, "I suppose you will comply with my application without further delay?" He said, "I will have to see Sir John first—I don't think we can give you any more than one-half of what you are applying for." I said, "I am entitled to the whole of it, the same as any other applicant." He said, "I will have to see Sir John first and will meet you here in an hour." I met him in an hour and he told me I couldn't get it at all—Sir John Macdonald had told him I couldn't get it—that it would have to be put up to public competition, because some other very important supporters of Sir John had also applied for the same piece of ground—though long subsequent to me—and when I pressed him to tell me

who these important people were, he gave me amongst others the name of Mr. Henry Bulmer's son, of Montreal. I then told him that he could tell Sir John for me that I believed he had been trifling with me in the whole of this transaction, asked him to give me back the letter Mr. Pope had given him. This he did not do, as he said it had been mislaid, and I neither got the letter nor the land.

Another instance of his insincerity and duplicity occurred in this way—Sir Donald Smith honored me by an invitation to accompany him on one of his trips in the North-West about the time that their St. Paul & Manitoba line was complete, on which occasion I wrote, for my amusement, a series of nine or ten letters, which at the request of Lord Mount Stephen, Sir Donald Smith and Mr. Angus, I consented to have published, and some thousands of the pamphlet were published and circulated very extensively over the country, showing the advantages and the conclusions that I had arrived at in my opinion in regard to the character of the North-West. Mr. Stephen was so well pleased with them that in driving through the country with him, he said to me, "This railroad, (meaning the St. Paul & Manitoba,) being about completed, will do away with the utility of our steamboats on the Red River, and I think there is a very good speculation if you purchase our boats," (of which there were several,) "and place them on the Saskatchewan and Assiniboia Rivers, and you have been of such service to us that I will practically give you the boats for anything you like to offer me." Mr. Stephen went on to observe that during the construction of the Pacific Railway these boats would be of immense service to the contractors and to the promotion of the Government enterprise, and suggested that I should at once see Sir John Macdonald on the subject. He said, "The boats will be of no further use to us, we will give them to you for next to nothing, as we do not desire to have them on the Red River at all competing with our own road." On my return to Montreal I at once went to Ottawa and consulted a gentleman of that city in relation to the scheme, and saw Sir John about it. Sir John's remark to me was, "Mitchell, it's the very thing we want, we'll do anything we can to forward it, what is it you propose?" I stated that I hadn't exactly settled upon the details of my proposition, but I wanted either a grant of land or a money subsidy from the Government to encourage the enterprise. He said to me, "Fix upon the details of your scheme and submit it to me, and in the meantime see the different members of the Cabinet to impress them with your views upon it." I saw every one of them and they all seemed to look upon it as a scheme to be of great service to the Government, the country and the contractors, carrying the mails and carrying the supplies for the construction of the road. I fixed upon the details of my scheme, put it in writing, had an engraved chart made of the section of the country, at a cost of about seven hundred dollars, took it to Sir John Macdonald, told him what the other Ministers had said about it, and he promised to put it through. Weeks elapsed and nothing was done—but I discovered on my next visit to Ottawa, where I went in order to get it put through, that Mr. Brydges, who was then in charge of the Hudson Bay corporation, having got wind of the scheme, had been visiting Sir John at Ottawa. What took place between them I do not know, but this I do know—that Mr. Brydges was hostile to it, and when I visited Sir John he told me that the scheme would have to be abandoned as the Hudson Bay had already a steamboat on the Saskatchewan and it would interfere with the operations of that company—so my time and money was again wasted, and this result did not tend to give me any more faith in Sir John Macdonald than I had had before.

I will give still another instance of the ill-treatment I got. I think it was in

the summer of 1871, there was a by-election in Welland County, Ontario, between Thompson and King (I think it was caused by the death of Mr. Street). I was then a member of Sir John's Cabinet. Sir John was extremely anxious to carry the county in the interests of King—He sent for me, saying that he wanted me to go and help canvass the county, which I did—At the same time he said to me, "Mitchell, is there any way that you know of that I could get four or five thousand dollars for an election fund, as we are very short of money?" I told him I thought there was, and he said it would be a great obligation to him if I could manage it. I did manage it—I got a friend of mine, after telegraphing to him, to authorize me to give four thousand dollars to Sir John Macdonald, which I did. The party was looking for some favors from the Government at the time, and could afford to give the money, and which favors were subsequently granted to him, all of which I explained to Sir John Macdonald at the time. Some few years after this friend, in talking over the matter, to my surprise, expressed some doubt as to whether I had ever given Sir John the money. I said, "Come over to Sir John and satisfy yourself on that point." We went to Sir John and I said to him, "Sir John, do you recollect the conversation that took place prior to the Welland election, in which I handed you four thousand dollars from this gentleman?" "No," said Sir John, "I don't recollect anything about it." "Why," said I, "Sir John, you surely must recollect it, I handed it to you in Ontario bank notes, sent my Secretary, Mr. Tilton, to the bank, got the money and I handed it to you in your own office." He answered me that he couldn't recollect a thing about it. I remonstrated with him, but it was no use, he persisted in his denial, and we had to leave him at that. My friend, on leaving turned to me and said, "I hope you are satisfied now that my suspicions were right?" I said, "I am satisfied that your suspicions are all wrong and that Sir John Macdonald is a strange man." I had years before ceased to be a member of his Cabinet and he had again come into power after 1878. I took my friend over to my office, got Mr. Tilton to get my Ontario Bank cheque book and bank book. In the margin of one was the memo of the cheque, with the initials of my friend's name on it and in the bank book the corresponding date on which the cheque for four thousand dollars, which I gave to Sir John Macdonald, was charged. I showed these to my friend, but nothing would satisfy him but that I had kept the money. I said, "I'll take these over and show them to Sir John Macdonald, perhaps they will refresh his mind." I went within half an hour back to Sir John Macdonald, with these books, showed him the entries and said, "Surely, Sir John, you recollect it yourself?" "Why," said he, "of course I do, recollect all about it, recollected it all along"—but says he, "you did very wrong, Peter, to bring that man to me, why didn't you come alone?" I said, "What good would that do? I had to bring the man in order to satisfy him. If you had recollected the transaction all along, you have done me an irreparable injury in denying it, and I ask you now at once to sit down and write me a letter, acknowledging that you got the money, before I leave this office, or if you do not, I will expose the whole transaction—I am not going to have my character and reputation injured by such work as this"—and he did it. I took the letter to the gentleman, but nothing would convince him but that I had kept the money, and it broke up a lifetime's friendship between that gentleman and myself, and he threatened to sue me for it and did so. I went to visit him when he was very sick on his dying bed, and after sitting about half an hour with him, when I left him to go to my hotel, I found the sheriff of the county waiting to serve me with a writ for the action. So much for the consideration that Sir John Macdonald had for other people's characters.



After the incident which occurred at the Rideau Club, I had made up my mind that I would have nothing more to do with Sir John Macdonald, either in believing his promises or expecting any fair play or justice from him. The general election of 1882 came on—I again went down to contest my county against Mr. Snowball, who as you will recollect I have stated defeated me through Sir John Macdonald's misrepresentations to me about the National Policy, and I was elected by acclamation, Mr. Snowball retiring at the eleventh hour, for reasons best known to himself. I declared on the hustings that if the people wanted my services they must elect me on the same lines as I was elected in 1873, that of thorough independence, and they did it. For two years after my return I gave Sir John Macdonald a very generous support from an independent standpoint—occasionally my duty called upon me to vote against him, but as a general rule I voted with him. The time came round when the Riel Rebellion broke out, and I had firm belief, from close personal observation of the events transpiring in the North-West, that had Sir John Macdonald, who was Minister of the Interior at the time, paid reasonable attention to the duties of his Department, that outbreak never would have reached the proportions that it did. It, however, did break out and the result is now a matter of history. That rebellion cost this country about nine millions of dollars—I am referring to the second rebellion—During the progress of it and before the rebellion was subdued, Mr. Blake moved a motion condemnatory of the Government and ascribing to them the responsibility for it. Sir John Macdonald replied to Mr. Blake and I shortly after spoke upon the subject, and while stating that I would not vote for Mr. Blake's motion because war was rife in the country and under such circumstances it was no time to put the Government on their trial, I still believed that the causes of all that difficulty lay at the door of Sir John Macdonald as the head of the Department of the Interior, and so stated to the house; but that if Mr. Blake would bring up his motion at the next session, I would second it, as the country had a right to know who was responsible for the trouble and the enormous outlay of nine millions of dollars which these troubles cost the country. Next session Mr. Blake came across the House to where I was seated and said to me, "Mitchell, do you recollect what you said last session about seconding me in my motion in relation to the North-West? Are you still willing to do it?" I said, "Yes, I am always ready to do what I say." "Then you will second my motion?" he said. I said, "Yes," and I did it. From that day forth Sir John Macdonald declared war against me, took away the patronage of my county and gave it to Mr. Adams, whom he had succeeded in diverting from the support of myself through the efforts of Mr. Costigan, his co-religionist, and he allowed me for two months to be making recommendations which never were carried out, in place of frankly telling me what he had done, and it resulted in a very lengthy correspondence between the acting leader of the Government, Sir Hector Langevin, (Sir John being ill and not able to attend to the duties of the House at the time,) which some day or other may probably be moved for in the House. As I questioned the right of the Government to do what Sir John Macdonald did to me, from that day forth it was war, and I struck back as forcibly as I knew how. His Franchise Bill, which I considered a rotten and expensive measure, I opposed to the best of my ability in many of its details. On its general principle I supported Sir John and opposed Mr. Blake, who desired to see the list of the Provinces adopted, and I am not quite sure now with the experience of the past few years that I did right—but it seemed to me at that time illogical to adopt Mr. Blake's motion that the minor provinces should make the list for the greater Parliament. Later on I

had occasion to oppose very strongly the attempts made by the Government to increase the duties upon the provisions of the people, which they did and effected my constituents by increasing the duties on pork from three dollars to six dollars a barrel, and after a long continued fight, I succeeded in forcing a compromise upon that particular item by which mess pork which was the class which was chiefly used by the lumbermen and fishermen of my country, was left at three dollars a barrel, while the other grades were increased to six, and to some extent in this way saved the additional tax of my people. The feelings which had been excited between Sir John and myself had become so intense that very little intercourse existed between us, except across the floor of the House, as soon as I found out that he was bringing out a rival candidate against me. Sir John Macdonald dissolved the House in 1886 and had a winter election, as he also had in 1890, shortening the term of the house by one year on each occasion, and showing an utter disregard of the health and comfort of the people who had to run as candidates for the several constituencies, and by so doing really endangered the health of many of the candidates. In a county such as mine was, of such very great extent, it was no child's play to travel night and day through 5 and 6 feet of snow in carrying on a contest, and in my opinion he showed an utter disregard of the health and comforts of the candidates. On that occasion of 1886 he brought Mr. Adams out to oppose me, and used the whole influence of the railway running through our country to defeat me without effect, and I was returned by a large majority—and the strained relations continued to exist between us during the four years that that Parliament lasted. The general election of 1890 came on. He again brought Mr. Adams out to oppose me and owing to the fact that I had not been in the county for two years, was a very sick man when I started to go down to contest the county, was confined to my room during the whole contest, had all the power of the Government and a good deal of money opposed to me, I was defeated and have since been in private life. One of the principal causes of my defeat was the fact that Sir John Macdonald used the patronage which he had at his disposal, in my opinion, in a most shameful way to defeat me, by promising that if a certain gentleman, the Hon. J. B. Snowball, who had always been opposed to Sir John and was elected against me in 1878, opposed to the National Policy, would support Mr. Adams, he would make him a senator, which he did, for once in his life promptly fulfilling his pledge, a very unusual thing with him.

I have avoided in this letter making any remarks upon Sir John's habits or private character, except so far as they affected the public interests, nor do I desire to do so, except in vindication of my own conduct and the feelings that I entertain about his memory. I consider him to have introduced into this country a system of neglect and procrastination in the administration of public affairs and of extravagances, which we are now suffering from—that he violated his pledges to me in the several ways that I have mentioned and that so far from revering his memory, I have every reason to condemn it. As a Minister, I was faithful and true to him, and have left an official record behind me that I need not be ashamed of, while his treatment of me exhibited both injustice and ingratitude.

There are many other minor instances which I might enumerate here, but I think I have said sufficient to justify myself in your estimation as to the grounds I have for thinking and speaking harshly of Sir John Macdonald's character. Of course everyone who ever had any business with him knows the procrastinating character he possessed; but as my intercourse with him was a very close one, I perhaps saw more of it than most men.

Now, in conclusion, my dear Mr. Gault, I would like to ask you whether you think the memory of such a character is of such a nature as justifies you and your friends for erecting statues to his memory? Of course it is your right and your friends' to do with your money as you like; but do you believe that you are doing justice to the rising generations of Canada, when fathers and mothers are leading their children passed these statues which are to be erected in the cities and parks of Canada, they will, probably in ignorance of the true character of the man, point out to those children that Sir John Macdonald is a man whose conduct should be emulated and whose reputation and character is one to admire? If you do, I certainly do not.

Hoping that you will excuse this long epistle, which you are at liberty to use in any way you like, I beg to remain,

Yours very sincerely,

P. MITCHELL [signature in pencil]

---

## Reviews

### Canadian

*Arthur Meighen. I. The Door of Opportunity.* By ROGER GRAHAM. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited. 1960. Pp. x, 341. \$7.50.

CONSERVATIVE PRIME MINISTERS since John A. Macdonald have been dismissed by historians as punctuations between Liberal eras. They have been remembered by some vague association—Borden with Canadian autonomy or Bennett with the depression—with no biographical attempts to analyse their personalities or the problems they faced. Arthur Meighen, thanks to Mackenzie King and Eugene Forsey, has been neatly pigeon-holed as the odd man out in the King-Byng episode. Historians have been satisfied with the conclusion that he may have been constitutionally right but he was certainly politically wrong and can therefore be ignored because he was of unsound political judgment. He is credited with being outstanding as an orator, a debater, and a parliamentarian, but what he said is forgotten. This, the first of a two-volume biography, deals with Meighen's career only until his selection as party leader and Prime Minister in 1920. This in itself gives Meighen's career a new perspective.

The Meighen described by Roger Graham confirms the popular judgment of his talents. His oratorical style is described and illustrated—and commended—for its logical structure, its lucid presentation, and its unemotional appeal to the intelligence of his audience. Meighen emerges as the dedicated controversialist who relished verbal rough and tumbles and was never happier than when he was shredding the argument of an opponent or even of a colleague. Graham's examples include the vitriol as well as the rapier. They suggest that respect for Meighen would be tinged more with fear than with admiration. This is not Graham's interpretation. He is inclined to explain personal antagonism to Meighen as petty jealousy rather than a reaction to Meighen's arrogance.

The broad outline of Meighen's career in these years also remains unchanged. Graham describes in some detail his contribution to the railway policy of the Borden government and argues convincingly that he, more than any other man, was the creator of the National Railway System. Meighen's parliamentary contributions to the closure debate, the Wartime Elections and Military Voters Acts, and the conscription debate are also outlined. Graham, however, has little new evidence to present. The Meighen Papers are apparently of little help to the biographer for these years. He has used the Borden Papers and the Borden Diary extensively as a supplement but many of the personal details have come from notes prepared for him by Meighen in the last ten years. As a result the volume sometimes reads like a personal memoir rather than a biography.

Graham admires Meighen and makes no attempt to conceal his conclusion that Meighen was an intellectual giant among political pygmies. Like most Canadian

politicians, Meighen paid little heed to abstract principles. He was, as Graham shows, prepared to defend public ownership of railways with his usual enjoyment of controversy because he was convinced that it was unavoidable. Even on the tariff he is shown as willing to make concessions to western farmers but finally adopting a protectionist policy to win support for his party in Quebec. Graham explains and justifies Meighen's conclusions by presenting Meighen's own arguments. It is a credit to both subject and author that the arguments are always logical. Meighen, however, seems always to have concluded that those who disagreed with him were stupid or prejudiced and his biographer is inclined to agree with him. Mackenzie King, for example, is fatuous, the colossal egoist, the constitutional demagogue, seeking always to compound confusion, and without any compensating talents. Graham clearly shares Meighen's contempt for King and, despite King's absence from the House during the central years, has already made him the villain of the piece. Mackenzie King was a successful party leader and the reader must conclude either that Graham assumed that the unpleasant characteristics attributed to him accounted for his success or that Graham's judgment, like Meighen's, was distorted by distaste.

Nor does the biographer suggest that behind Meighen's pragmatism there may lurk a callous authoritarianism. Graham presents the arguments for the Elections and Military Voters Acts—and also the indignation of the Liberals—but without suggesting that Meighen was disturbed by the moral implications of this use of power. Similarly with the Winnipeg strike, Meighen concluded that the authority of the Government was at stake and shared the responsibility for the repressive measures adopted. Graham explains why Meighen did not try to act as mediator but does not suggest that here was a serious limitation in Meighen as a politician. He showed no sympathy for the social aspiration of postwar Canadians, as marked by rural and urban protest movements—nor for the bitterness of French Canadians. His response was to consolidate the Union government by an intensive campaign of party organization. Meighen, the controversialist, reacted to attacks on the Government by counter-attacks.

At times, the admiration of the biographer for his subject has him concluding that the faults of the system explain the failure of the man. Two brief quotations will suffice. "Meighen was to experience a deep disillusionment with the process of democracy as he discovered in politics reason did not always prevail." (p. 45) And again; "He was a controversialist in an age when intelligent controversy was already ceasing to be fashionable." (p. 296) For those like myself who are sceptical of Meighen's political talents, such comments only confirm misgivings.

But there is no doubt that, whatever the reader's bias, he does have reactions while reading this book. Graham's undisguised admiration sometimes becomes partisanship but it always gives a vitality to issues which are too often made dull. Like Meighen, he is a controversialist. His prose sparkles and his arguments strike. He is an advocate—but Arthur Meighen would not complain of his counsel.

H. BLAIR NEATBY

Laurier House

*In Search of Canadian Liberalism.* By FRANK H. UNDERHILL. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited. 1960. Pp. xiv, 282. \$5.00.

FRANK UNDERHILL has written an unconventional autobiography, an examination of his own rather than of his nation's constant search for a definable liberal position,

and an exciting collection of what he considers to be his most representative essays written over more than three decades, 1927-1960. The collection is an honest one, as all successful autobiography must be, for Underhill realizes that his most representative work will not always be his best, and he has had the courage not only to permit inconsistencies to stand, but to group his essays in such a way as to make his sometimes repetitious and sometimes contradictory statements even more noticeable. His repetitions—in his insistence that liberalism with a small "l" is the most important social or political stand a man can take or in his restatement of Calhoun's concurrent majority as an explanation for Canada's bi-racial political parties—provide the continuity of a constant search. His inconsistencies and changes, best shown in his frequent attempts to retire W. L. Mackenzie King before his time, reveal the nature of the search itself.

Underhill precedes his collection of twenty-seven essays, speeches, scholarly articles, and columns, with a brief but pungent autobiographical introduction. (In 1950 he also added what amounts to a page or so of autobiography to his superb essay on Goldwin Smith, first published in 1933.) And some of the selections—especially "Keep Canada out of War," from a 1937 issue of *Maclean's*—have their chief merit as autobiography as well. In short, Underhill has written what Roy Pascal, in his recent *Design and Truth in Autobiography*, would have to consider a highly successful selfexamination: a book which repeatedly reveals and sometimes confronts the author's conception of his own relationship to the world, repetitiously arrested in a series of points in time.

The book is divided into three sections, the first consisting of five essays on "The Liberal Past," including Underhill's presidential address to the Canadian Historical Association in 1946. The second section, "Political Controversy in the 1930s and 1940s," consists of several items from the *Canadian Forum* on King, an excellent address on J. S. Woodsworth, and essays relating to the Canadian party system. The final section, "The Calm of the 1950s," shows Underhill in a slightly mellower mood (he prefers the word urbane) and includes what this reviewer considers to be his finest essay, "Canada and the Canadian Question, 1954." This organization is defective if one wishes to study the evolution of Underhill's prose style—which is sparkling throughout, but the nature of the sparkle changes with time—or if one wishes to see him grow as a historian or consistent political theorist. But since all of the articles can be read elsewhere, and since Canadian historians may reasonably be expected to be familiar with at least seven of the essays already, Underhill clearly has chosen this organization to highlight the controversies which interest him. And, after all, the reader is free to read the essays in any order he chooses if he is more interested in the content than in the man.

The man himself is controversial and, to a reader from south of the border, refreshingly so among Canadian historians. Underhill has never been afraid to generalize, to enter into political debate, to offend, to find parallels in United States history (although some of the parallels break down rather quickly), or to be witty. Some of his epigrams sound vaguely familiar ("the secret of a good style is to have something to say") but most are fresh and memorable: "We are a people incapable of tragedy"; "Canadians . . . as inveterate newspaper readers, are a people with short memories"; "The man who is afraid of making enemies will never make followers"; economists are "the intellectual garage-mechanics of Canadian capitalism." If only the woollen flag and the empire could have been included!

The man who emerges is a permanent oppositionist, a self-confessed "natural minoritarian" who exults in refusal, who is unable to take any doctrinaire position



for long. It seems typical that even in the ferment at Oxford Underhill was only an associate member of the Fabian Society, for he "wasn't quite sure." A North York Presbyterian Grit, a professional gadfly of the best kind and a nationalist of the most productive, Underhill criticizes Canada rather than the United States because he is vitally, passionately concerned with making Canada better rather than with making the United States seem worse. In many ways he is a twentieth-century Goldwin Smith without Smith's final resignation. A man seemingly always young and energetic, he knows the sweet and not so safe pleasure of criticizing an establishment from within. He concludes that J. W. Dafoe and Woodsworth were "the two greatest Canadians of my adult years," and he even comes to have a certain admiration for King as the "leader who divided [Canada] least." His spiritual odyssey forms the real core of the book; the articles themselves merely serve to bind together in convenient form most of the chief contributions Underhill has made to Canadian historiography, except for his several articles on Edward Blake, contributions already quite familiar to historians of the Canadian scene. The book concludes with a list of some of Underhill's other writings.

Professor Underhill's collection probably will cause quiet controversy in some academic quarters, although not among politicians, where controversy of this kind is needed. This reviewer, not privy to the many meanings which some of Underhill's sentences must carry ("For now that I have reached my seventieth birthday I wish that I could be as sure about anything as some people I know are about everything."), but aware of Underhill's career, first at the University of Saskatchewan, at length with the University of Toronto (1927-55), and ultimately at Laurier House, has heard some remark that they wish Underhill would get on with his biography of Blake. Fine; Blake is an interesting person—but Frank Underhill is more so, and no less influential. One can hope that this "natural-born protestant" will write his full autobiography, mixing career with character as he has mixed history with controversy here. And in the meantime some of us can get to work writing a few of the many books and dissertations which Underhill's sparkling generalizations suggest—and demand.

ROBIN W. WINKS

Yale University

*The Canadian Journal of Lady Aberdeen, 1893-1898.* Edited with an Introduction by JOHN T. SAYWELL. Toronto: The Champlain Society. 1960. Pp. lxxxiv, 518. Free to members.

THE CHAMPLAIN SOCIETY has not published a volume which combines to a greater degree than the present one historical substance and general interest. What have hitherto been among the more obscure years of Canadian history are now vividly illuminated. Areas of Canadian life, up to now little known and comparatively undocumented, are revealed in these pages. We have here the decorum and the absurdities of the vice-regal court, the fierce pretensions of Ottawa society, the rancour of the sectarian divisions of Canadian life, the stilted beginnings of women's secular organizations. For the student of Canadian politics, and especially of the Manitoba School Question, the volume is a major source, and to the biographer, the novelist, and the general reader its pages will yield abundant siftings.

Mr. Saywell's Introduction matches the *Journal* in interest. It is in the first place an effective presentation of the Aberdeens as personalities and in their official

role. It is in the second place a consummate essay on the intricate politics of the years which saw political preponderance in Canada shift, slowly and with many checks, from the Conservative to the Liberal party. Mr. Saywell has already won a reputation as one of the few Canadian historians who write with equal knowledge and assurance of French and of English Canada. In this Introduction he traces with a satisfying skill the decisions and the chances which alienated Adolphe Chapleau and the Bleus from the Conservative party and made that party dependent on the ultramontanes and the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Quebec. The result was, with Sir John Thompson's death and Sir Mackenzie Bowell's ineptitude, the delivery of that province to the Liberals for over sixty years.

The *Journal* and the Introduction clarify or alter what has been known so far of a number of important questions. It is now apparent that, despite a succession of misfortunes, of which Thompson's death was the chief, and a series of blunders, of which the alienation of Chapleau was the most serious, the fall of the Conservative government was by no means foreordained, or its cause so lost a one as it has seemed. On the great question of the official partiality or impartiality of the Liberal Aberdeens in their dealings with the Conservative Prime Ministers, the *Journal* makes it clear that they were formally impartial in word and deed up to the Cabinet crisis of 1896. Even their personal affection for the Lauriers was matched by that in which they held Sir John and Lady Thompson. The one firm prejudice Lady Aberdeen maintained throughout was her dislike and distrust of Sir Charles Tupper, no doubt the true feminist's dislike of the blatantly masculine. There is, however, no evidence that her attitude to the elder Tupper affected the actions of her husband. But that Aberdeen was ready in January, 1896, to call on Laurier to form a government Mr. Saywell thinks beyond reasonable doubt, as he does that suspicion of this readiness drove the Conservatives to patch up their differences. It is perhaps just to suppose that the suspicions were founded not only on what was observed at the time, but also on the known Liberal sympathies of the Aberdeens, sympathies Lady Aberdeen barely attempted to conceal in private. So much seems clear. On the other hand, our knowledge of the constitutional issue raised by Aberdeen's refusal to sign the appointments recommended by the defeated Tupper is amplified in detail but not materially altered.

Important as it is as a source of political history, the *Journal*, it might well be argued, is even more important for the social historian. The founding under Lady Aberdeen's inspiration of the National Council of Women and the Victorian Order of Nurses is a chapter of great interest to all concerned with voluntary work and the origins of social welfare. Few accounts are so revealing of the character of Canadian society at that time as the comments on the sectarian bitterness and denominational divisions which had to be overcome to establish the National Council of Women. When these are added to the material on the School Question, the reader is tempted to declare that the basic history of Canada must consist of the history of religious bigotry in Canada. Perhaps the real significance of the election of 1896 is not that the Liberals won, but that the Bleus through the Liberal party defeated the ultramontanes and so spared Canada, and religion in Canada, the disaster of a clerical ascendancy at Ottawa.

As a period piece, the *Journal* is particularly satisfying. The great depression of the times is always in the background, and particularly in the journeys through the prairies. But the first signs of the great boom to follow are present too, the mineral finds at Rossland, the first American immigrants in the West, the Yukon gold rush. The old winter sports of tobogganning and snowshoeing, the domestic

illnesses including the annual and bilingual affliction, *la grippe*, the ice carnivals and the costumes balls devoted to Canadian historical themes, all these will stir the memories of those who have any recollection of the years before 1914. Here is late Victorian Canada, homely, provincial, and aspiring; here, too, is the Canada of the twentieth century, buffeted by great power politics, distracted by internal divisions, never quite up to the destiny events were forcing upon it.

The *Journal* has been edited with an unobtrusive competence. The provision of the biographical Appendix is a useful addition to a journal in which there are constant references to people, many of whom do not appear again. But the editors have nodded occasionally. On page 408, for example, "Olser" and "Ryser" (in Toronto) and "Cochrane Gallery" (in Washington) called for correction, whether the error was in the script or a misprint. Nor is the proof reading impeccable; "Sarnuia," for example, in the footnote on page 363, is not a concealed misprint. Minor blemishes of this sort are particularly regrettable in the Publications of the Champlain Society and in what is likely to be one of its most distinguished volumes.

W. L. MORTON

University of Manitoba

*Cavelier de la Salle*. By ROGER VIAU. Figures canadiennes, I. Tours, France: Maisson Mame [Montreal: Association canadienne d'Édition Ltée]. 1960. Pp. 183. \$1.50.

*Les Fougueux Bâtisseurs de la Nouvelle France*. By SERGE FLEURY. Figures canadiennes, II. Tours, France: Maisson Mame [Montreal: Association canadienne d'Édition Ltée]. 1960. Pp. 194. \$1.50.

*Maisonnewe*. By PIERRE BENOIT. Figures canadiennes, III. Tours, France: Maisson Mame [Montreal: Association canadienne d'Édition Ltée]. 1960. Pp. 189. \$1.50.

THIS NEW SERIES OF POCKET BOOKS consists of short biographies of leading Canadian figures and is intended chiefly for the schools, but the editor hopes that it will also appeal to the general public.

Roger Viau's *Cavelier de la Salle* is well written, takes account of the most recent research, and compresses into a short space the essentials of La Salle's career. He is clearly sympathetic towards his subject but he does not attempt to gloss over the flaws in La Salle's character. In short, one is left with a clear and quite convincing picture of this complex man who played a devious but significant role in the history of the continent.

The second book in the series, *Les Fougueux Bâtisseurs*, consists of ten vignettes of men who were important in the founding and consolidation of New France. Included are Charles Le Moyne, Louis Hébert, Marc Lescarbot, Pierre d'Iberville, François Hertel, Nicolas Perrot, Pierre Boucher, Radisson and Groseilliers, Louis Jolliet, and the founders of Acadia. Some of these men deserve a volume to themselves, particularly Pierre d'Iberville. Yet the author succeeds admirably in compressing into a very few pages the essentials of the careers and contributions of these men and does so in a lucid style that makes the book a pleasure to read.

Unfortunately, one cannot say as much for the third book, *Maisonnewe*. It is more an account of the founding of Montreal than a biography of its founder and the author has employed a literary technique that is to be regretted. He has chosen to cast the book in the form of imaginary first person narratives by the

personages associated with Maisonneuve. He begins with a dialogue between the bronze figures at the base of Maisonneuve's statue on Place d'Armes. We are then presented with the old legendary account of the miraculous inception of the plan to found the mission at Montreal. In the short list of works consulted by the author, William Henry Atherton's, *Montreal under the French Regime* and Thomas B. Costain's, *The White and the Gold*, appear. Conspicuous by its absence from the list is Professor E. R. Adair's article, *The Evolution of Montreal under the French Régime*. One thing this volume does point up, however, is the lack of a sound biography of Maisonneuve, not to mention a history of Montreal.

This one volume apart, the series *Figures canadiennes* has made a good beginning and will serve a very useful purpose. It is to be hoped that before long some publisher will launch a similar series in English.

W. J. ECCLES

University of Alberta

*Papineau. Textes choisis et présentés par FERNAND OUELLET. Cahiers de l'Institut d'Histoire, Université Laval, 1. Quebec: Les Presses Universitaires Laval, 1958. Pp. 104.*

FERNAND OUELLET, whose work on Papineau represents one of the most interesting pieces of revision in current historical writing in Canada, has gathered together a selection of documents illustrating the evolution of Papineau's point of view. There is a brief, suggestive introduction to the whole work, as well as a few explanatory sentences attached to each document. In all, it is an exceptionally useful collection and illustrates the complexities and contradictions in the ideas of "Le Roi Louis-Joseph Ier."

Perhaps the most interesting feature of Papineau's thought is the conflict between his liberalism and his nationalism. In the early documents he appears as a loyal monarchist speaking of George III in terms of adulation and praising Great Britain for the liberality of its treatment of the French Canadians. Moreover his view of the relation of the colony to the Imperial authority is that of a defender of the complete sovereignty of the British parliament over the colony. "Le proposition que nous ne devons l'obéissance qu'aux loix auxquelles nous avons consenti lui paroissoit tout-à-fait insoutenable; puisque le parlement britannique avoit constamment exercé une autorité législative suprême sur les colonies," he said in 1824, citing Benjamin Franklin to support his contention. Gradually Papineau moved a step away from this position, arguing that the imperial government should exercise this sovereignty in conformity with the needs of the colony. This argument was coupled with a growing belief that circumstances were so different in North America from those which existed in Europe that only a government based on Canadian conditions could meet the needs of the colonists. In short, he argued that North America was democratic, Europe aristocratic, and that the two types of society were incompatible. Soon he began to view the United States as "notre modèle et notre étude." Since the legislative sovereignty of the British parliament seemed to preclude the possibility of responsible government (though Papineau never used this term in the sense that Robert Baldwin did) Papineau moved inevitably, if hesitantly, to the position of a revolutionary. After the failure of the Rebellion, of course, he came to think that the best solution to the problems of French Canada lay in a loose association with the United States.

Accompanying the development of Papineau's views as a liberal critic of the

system of 1791, was the growth of an increasingly strong nationalism. "Une nation n'en sut jamais gouverner une autre," he declared in 1834. But his nationalism was based on conservative assumptions. He opposed the English merchants and their plans for a commercial empire, both because they were English and because they were merchants. (Another reason for his distrust of the Loyalists was summed up in the sentence, "Il semble que la liberté qu'ils aiment tant en Angleterre, n'ait plus d'attrait pour eux ici.") His ideal society for Lower Canada was based on the preservation of the seigniorial system and the legal structure of New France. It was over the question of the abolition of the seigniorial system that Papineau broke with his fellow liberals. In Papineau, Ouellet has argued effectively, the conflict between the liberal politician and the social conservative was resolved in favour of the latter. In this, he says, Papineau fulfilled Garneau's description of "le chef" as "l'image de notre nation." Since Ouellet is a liberal of the contemporary anti-agrarian myth school, he does not succumb to the nationalism of Papineau as did such earlier writers as Filteau.

A reading of these documents confirms the picture of Papineau as a reluctant, vacillating rebel, a "Franklin sans être Washington," or, as Robert Nelson put it bitterly, "C'est un homme bon seulement pour parler et non pour agir." The collection should prove very useful to teachers of Canadian history and to those students who will take the trouble to read French.

RAMSAY COOK

University of Toronto

*Les Cahiers des Dix*, 25. Montréal: Editions des Dix. 1960. Pp. 309.

LES DIX have published the twenty-fifth issue of their well-known *Cahiers*. As usual, they offer a book full of interesting reading, enriched, this time, with a frontispiece showing the twenty Superiors of the Collège de Montréal and two *photographies hors-texte*, one of Pierre De Sales Laterrière and the other of his son Marc-Pascal.

Also as usual, the articles cover a wide range, reflecting as they do the tastes and current interests of each of Les Dix. And perhaps because this issue is a kind of milestone in their literary and historical partnership, several of the authors have decided to write an *aperçu général* sort of article. Jacques Rousseau, who has just recently joined the faculty of the Sorbonne, describes "Les Premiers Canadiens," at the time of their first contact with the white man. Social habits, crafts, arts, and peculiar customs, all are vividly portrayed for each of the main tribes, from the western Kwakiults to the Iroquois on the east coast and the Esquimaux up north. At the end, Dr. Rousseau adds a valuable bibliography of works both French and English. Victor Morin writes about "L'Évolution de la médecine au Canada français," from the first autopsy performed by Jacques Cartier on Philippe Rougemont in 1535 to the founding of the Medical School of the University of Montreal in 1927. This is an entertaining article—unfortunately, Morin's last. Léo-Paul Desrosiers surveys the year 1660, a decisive one in New France's history, and one which he analyses with skill. He notes, in passing and with proper perspective, "L'exploit du Long-Sault." Mgr. Olivier Maurault gives a series of biographical notes on each of the Superiors of the Collège de Montréal since its foundation in 1767, a tribute to these religious, and an imposing reminder of their Society's contribution to French Canada's cultural growth. Léon Trépanier tells the story of Montreal's city halls since the days of the "hangar des habitants" of 1644. Antoine Roy also writes of building; he gives,

in "Bois et pierre," a fine panorama of pre-Conquest construction and of the beginnings of stone masonry in French Canada.

Three other of Les Dix have concentrated, for this anniversary number, on the foundations and first problems of different institutions. Raymond Douville recalls "Les Lents Débuts d'une seigneurie des Jésuites." He analyses carefully and in detail the difficulties at Batiscan where the Jesuits, who had come out as missionaries and educators, found themselves faced with the unwelcome duties of colonization. Louis-Philippe Audet examines the rather complicated legislation of 1841 to give a clear presentation of the beginnings of Lower Canadian municipalities and of Lord Sydenham's School Law. Mgr. Albert Tessier describes the founding of "Les Soeurs des petites écoles" in the Rimouski of the 1870's, under the patronage of Bishop Langevin.

Gérard Malchelosse, who first thought of Les Dix, presents a critical study of the engaging *Mémoires romancés* of Pierre De Sales Laterrière (1747-1814), a fascinating character who remains so, even when stripped of the exaggerations which Malchelosse corrects. Jean Bruchési writes from Madrid where he is serving as Canada's ambassador "depuis le jour où j'ai eu l'honneur de présenter, dans un décor de rêves, mes lettres de créance au Caudillo." (p. 279) He presents a few little-known Hispano-Canadian tit-bits, such as the story of Premio-Real de Lavalle who was Spanish Consul General in Canada about 1877, and an account of Mgr. Paul Bruchési's reception at the Eucharistic Congress in Madrid in 1911.

In addition to these varied essays, this *Cahier* brings a most useful Index of all the articles published these last twenty-five years—and one which testifies eloquently to their authors' contribution to Canadian historical scholarship.

JACQUES MONET, S.J.

University of Toronto

*The Elements Combined: A History of the Steel Company of Canada.* By WILLIAM KILBOURN. Toronto and Vancouver: Clarke, Irwin & Company Ltd. 1960. Pp. xxii, 335. \$6.50.

THE OFFICERS OF THE Steel Company of Canada are to be congratulated on the imagination which led them to mark the corporation's fiftieth anniversary by inviting a professional historian to write a history of the company. Mr. Kilbourn was given access to the company records and a free hand in interpreting the results of his research, except on certain questions affecting the company's present position. No harm will be done to the public image of our largest Canadian-owned industrial enterprise; but the book is not a eulogy and for the general historian it is a valuable addition to the regrettably small shelf of Canadian business history.

"Stelco" was born in 1910 when Max Aitken brought together five Canadian companies whose origins go back as far as the small operations of the Montreal nail manufacturer, John Bigelow, in the 1790's. Mr. Kilbourn's account of this evolution provides many illustrations of the impact of social developments and government economic policies on a specific industry, and vice versa, from the pre-Confederation railway boom to the era of the Rand formula. It is clear that apart from the success of financiers like E. R. Wood, Senator G. A. Cox, and Sir Edmund Walker in establishing a reputable Canadian securities market Aitken could not have amassed sufficient Canadian and British capital to create the new



company without benefit of American financial resources. The company's history also shows that the Canadian iron and steel industry has shared fully in "the managerial revolution," although the pace has been slow. Until very recently nearly all the key administrators of the company came up through the steel business; in the author's view the creative ideas and good management which stemmed from this policy provide the central clue to the corporation's success. In all this there are no surprises, but fresh chapter and verse are provided for some of the standard generalizations about Canada's economic growth.

Mr. Kilbourn's dramatic and often enthralling descriptions of the processes of steel-making are memorable. So too are his portraits of some of the company's servants, from the hot-tempered, swearing, but pious Methodist, Frank McCune, who was the highly skilled open-hearth superintendent during the first four decades of this century, to the recently retired president, Ross H. McMaster. McMaster's conservative financial genius, and especially his resistance to the boom spirit of the late twenties, enabled the company to come through the great depression relatively unscathed. The chapter on the crucial strike of 1946 is a model of objectivity, although there is no doubt that the author is well disposed toward the United Steelworkers.

The book is handsomely produced, and attractively illustrated with wood engravings by Rosemary Kilbourn. It includes several charts showing the growth of the Canadian iron and steel industry, a glossary of terms used in the industry, and an outline of the technical aspects of steel production.

MARGARET PRANG

University of British Columbia

*The People's Power: The History of Ontario Hydro.* By MERRILL DENISON.  
Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited. 1960. Pp. viii, 295, maps, illus. \$7.50.

MR. DENISON, who has already displayed his talents in histories of privately-owned industries, turns his hand to the field of public ownership in this account of one of the earliest and most successful of government-created enterprises, Ontario Hydro. On the whole, this book is well written and the author demonstrates feeling when he explains the causes of the genesis of Hydro. Technical terms and phrases roll off his pen in a way that makes them comprehensible to those lacking an engineering background, and statistics, used to illustrate expansion, always make their point without being tedious. As the reader skims swiftly over the surface of the story of Ontario Hydro, however, carried along by the fine language of the writer, he feels at various places an overpowering urge to throw out the anchor and plumb the waters beneath.

Denison, rightly, allots over half the book to the era of Hydro's greatest exponent, the *prima donna* of provincial politics, Adam Beck. The background of the movement for public ownership is clearly outlined, and the Ross Power Bill of 1903 is properly shown to be an anaemic effort in contrast with that passed into law by the Whitney government. Beck's dramatic struggle against the monied private-power interests—Mann, Mackenzie, Pellatt, and Nicholls—and the powerful propaganda campaign they generated is well told; only on the issue of radials does Beck meet his match. The chapter on the creation of the Queenston-Chippawa generating station, and its attendant problems, is the finest in the book, and the ingenuity of Hydro's dedicated engineers is something to marvel at from first to last.

With the account of Beck's death in 1925, however, this book undergoes a

change, as did Hydro. Politics, important in the early story, are relegated to the background except for the brief tale of Mitchell Hepburn's activities against Hydro. The demagogic Liberal premier is portrayed as Hydro's *bête noire*, and the charges against Henry and Meighen, of a conflict of interests in the Abitibi purchase, are peremptorily pushed to one side. A formula occasionally applied to the writing of commissioned histories is used here: the amount of political discussion is directly proportional to the distance in time from the present. Hence, the latter half of the book mainly chronicles Hydro's growth to meet new needs, the demands of World War II and the period of heady expansion after it. The last chapter, which might more appropriately be titled "How To Live Better Electrically," is outright publicity, including an explanation of the continuing advantages of Hydro even if the rates rise in the future.

In the Foreword the author states that he has used two main sources: the Hydro Commission's annual reports and contemporary newspaper files. He also explains that the ready availability of these sources makes "formal annotation redundant"; however, it would be useful and interesting to have substantiating footnotes. Surely, also, some use could have been made of personal papers containing references to the development of Hydro—for example, those of Graham, Laurier, Whitney, and Willison—which are readily available in archives. Is there nothing in the four feet of Magrath Papers in Ottawa about the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of which C. A. Magrath was chairman for over five years? Failure to consider these materials is a grave omission.

Despite the sixty-eight pages of glossy pictures in this book, one feels that Hydro must have a better and more informative collection than this. Disappointing, too, is the absence of more political cartoons; the one reproduced here, from an era "politically safe," could have been supplemented by others on what has proved to be a perpetually lively subject. Occasional errors mar this work: the misspelling of the names of W. F. Maclean (p. 28), Beattie Nesbitt (pp. 28 and 33), John Ross Robertson (p. 207), and A. G. Lackner (illustrations); Christ Church, Moulinette (p. 261), is a frame structure not stone; and the reader is brought up short when he reads (p. 262) that the United Empire Loyalists of the St. Lawrence Valley were "Scottish Catholics and French Canadians."

Judging from the Foreword, this book has been about five years in preparation; the result is disappointing. This may be the story of Ontario Hydro, but it is not the history of it. What "The People's Power" has done is here recounted; how "The People's Power" works is not. The motto of Hydro is: the Gifts of Nature are for the People. The politics of Hydro, both internal and external, apparently are not.

CHARLES W. HUMPHRIES

Mount Allison University

## General

*Causation in the Law.* By H. L. A. HART and A. M. HONORÉ. Oxford: The Clarendon Press [Toronto: Oxford University Press]. 1959. Pp. xxxii, 446. \$8.25.

THIS BOOK ELUCIDATES the concept of causation as it is found in legal discourse. It will be of interest to historians because of the many illuminating parallels it draws between the linguistic conventions of history and the law. It should also interest them, however, as a phenomenon—as a concrete example of what they

may themselves legitimately expect (but have scarcely as yet begun to receive) from philosophers of the contemporary analytic school who turn from anti-metaphysical agitation to attempt the conceptual clarification of neighbouring fields. One of the authors of the present volume, the Professor of Jurisprudence at Oxford, is himself a distinguished contributor to philosophical journals of an analytic sort. His collaboration here with the Reader in Roman-Dutch Law at the same university vindicates most impressively the argument for "applied" philosophical studies.

Since the strength of the book lies in its careful examination of a host of actual causal judgments, any attempt to state its thesis shortly will do scant justice to the range and subtlety of the work. The chief question which it raises, however, can be put simply enough. In making causal judgments, whether in everyday affairs, historical enquiry, or legal contexts, it is clear that we generally single out as causes certain contingencies which are themselves less than sufficient conditions of their effects. This procedure implies a contrast, not only with what is utterly irrelevant to those effects, but also with what, although relevant, is to be regarded as just a set of background conditions necessary for the cause's "operation." For a full understanding of the significance of the causal judgment, therefore, we shall need to ask on what grounds the distinction between cause and mere condition is made.

Philosophers and methodologists who have considered this problem at all seem to have given one or other of two kinds of answers. Some, like the philosopher-historian, R. G. Collingwood, have argued that there is a single, pragmatic criterion, such as the selection of the condition most easily providing us with a "handle" for producing and preventing such effects at will. Others have regarded the selection as an arbitrary matter—not something which could be accounted for by reference to any publicly recognized criteria at all. According to Hart and Honoré, the principles of selection implicit in legal usage are neither simple, nor private, nor arbitrary. If we are sufficiently flexible in applying them, they can, in fact, be reduced to two guiding ideas. The first is that a voluntary human action has a special claim to be considered a cause. As lawyers sometimes put it, deliberate interventions can "break the chain of causation" which would otherwise obtain. The second is that causal conditions are usually abnormal ones—the notion of the "normal" varying systematically from context to context.

It is the belief of this reviewer that Hart and Honoré fail to establish what they would probably regard as their most important conclusion: that ordinary causal judgment, whether in history or the law, can be explained in terms of completely *objective* principles of selection. This is less because of any failure of the two principles mentioned to account for conclusions lawyers and historians draw than because those principles themselves, when closely examined, turn out to be quasi-evaluative. In the course of their discussion of the concept of "voluntariness," the co-authors virtually admit this at one point; for at least some of the considerations which count against calling an action fully voluntary (such as the extent to which the agent was threatened) require some estimate of "reasonableness" by the investigator. It seems equally doubtful that the notion of the "normal," as it is actually employed, can be regarded as value-free. But even if the book does not, for such reasons, achieve all it seems to promise, it offers by far the best discussion of the *working* concept of causation that has yet appeared in print. It deserves the close attention of everyone interested in the conceptual foundations of the social studies.

WILLIAM DRAY

University of Toronto

*Some 20th Century Historians: Essays on Eminent Europeans.* Edited by S. WILLIAM HALPERIN. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1961. Pp. xxii, 298. \$5.95.

DEDICATED TO Bernadotte E. Schmitt this volume of historiographical essays, written by a number of former students, comes as a natural supplement to a similar volume edited by Professor Schmitt in 1942 (*Some Historians of Modern Europe*). It is, therefore, both a tribute to his admirable works in historiography and to the strength of this subject at the University of Chicago.

Of the eleven historians whose work and views are analysed, five are dead and all but one was born before 1900. They represent the great outburst of historical research and writing at the end of the last century and in the first generation of this. Though they would all largely subscribe to the Rankean ideal they none the less run a wide gamut in their emphases and interpretations, from the social and economic outlook of Henri Pirenne through the liberalism of Viet Valentin and the spiritual views of Herbert Butterfield to the geographical and psychological stress of Lucien Febvre. Since with these are included studies of George M. Trevelyan, Georges Lefebvre, Pierre Renouvin, Sir Charles Webster, René Grousset, Erich Eyck, George P. Gooch and an introductory essay on Bernadotte Schmitt it will be seen how wide a variety of views is covered.

This estimable coverage of modern European historians should prove a valuable introduction to recent historiography, revealing the constant extension of historical research into even wider fields of human activity and into a worldwide point of view, bringing out the complexity of history, the swing away from oversimplified interpretation, and a reflection of the great problems of the twentieth century. Nothing could be more convincing than this group of essays that history-writing and the historian can never be divorced from their generation. Both editor and authors are to be congratulated on the quality of this contribution to historical literature.

RICHARD M. SAUNDERS

University of Toronto

*Quiberon Bay: The Campaign in Home Waters, 1759.* By GEOFFREY MARCUS. London: Hollis & Carter [Montreal: International Publishers]. 1960. Pp. xiv, 212. \$5.00.

*The Other Armada: The Franco-Spanish Attempt to Invade Britain in 1779.* By A. TEMPLE PATTERSON. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 1960. Pp. x, 247. 30s.

THOSE FOR WHOM HISTORY consists of poring over constitutional documents or examining the effects of economic forces on society may resent the idea that the Royal Navy has long been the most important single British institution. Yet it would still be hard to overrate the importance of an instrument which saved the island from the Spanish Inquisition in the sixteenth century, from Stuart tyranny restored by French arms in the seventeenth century, or from Napoleonic conquest in the nineteenth century, and which has twice preserved it from the Germans in our own age. It is therefore pleasant to see how much naval history has been published lately, and the two volumes here reviewed have a special interest for North Americans.

The battle of Quiberon Bay was fought three thousand miles from Canada and two months after Wolfe's victory at Quebec. The connection of the two events is still close. Through the summer of 1759, writes Mr. Marcus, "French squadrons lay in readiness at Toulon, Brest and Dunkirk; the French flotillas were waiting

to take on board the armies assembled in Flanders, Normandy and Brittany." Their purpose was to invade Britain; British forces at home were feeble, for, in this crisis Pitt had chosen to send his best troops to Canada and Germany. Till Churchill sent Britain's newest tanks round the Cape to Egypt in 1940, no war premier ventured on a strategy of comparable boldness. That is the standard by which the daring of the British conquest of Canada must be measured. Quebec would have been an empty triumph indeed if it had been followed by the spectacle of French troops swarming ashore on the English beaches, overpowering a weak opposition, and dictating peace in London. Such was the French intention, but it did not happen. Why and how it did not happen are questions which Geoffrey Marcus answers. Pitt trusted Hawke to prevent the Brest fleet from convoying French troops across the Channel. The fact that Hawke did this is no doubt familiar. But eighteenth-century fleets suffered much from long sea duty. Ropes and sails wore ragged, masts sprung, ships sailed ever slower as their bottoms grew ever more foul with barnacles and seaweed, stores of food and water ran short, men went sick; yet Hawke still kept guard over Brest and won his battle when the French came out. How he achieved this ranks among the more important questions posed by the Seven Years War. It cannot be answered here; the book *Quiberon Bay*, which does answer it, needs reading by any who desire an intelligent understanding of Canadian history.

Two decades after Quiberon Bay the British army was once again fighting in America, often with a brilliance for which it receives little credit and against odds which were commonly heavy. Howe had only 15,000 to pit against 19,000 when he landed on Manhattan to drive Washington out of New York; Cornwallis only 1,400 to lead against 3,000 when he routed Gates at Camden; Rawdon only 900 when he worsted Greene's 1,400 at Hobkirk's Hill. Yet the fruit of all these tactical achievements evaporated on October 19, 1781, when Cornwallis, his fortifications pounded to ruin by French siege artillery, surrendered to an army containing over 10,000 French regulars and half that number of Americans. A key question in determining the military causes of American independence is why Britain had so few and France so many troops on the west side of the Atlantic. Here Mr. Patterson supplies the answer. Britain had lost the naval supremacy gained in 1759, while Louis XVI had raised the French fleet to its peak of efficiency. By escaping defeat in 1778 off Ushant—that most decisive of drawn battles—the French fleet emboldened the Spaniards to declare war. In 1779 the two Bourbon fleets entered the Channel, in force outnumbering the British by 3 to 2, while 40,000 Frenchmen waited to invade. How this attempt failed is Mr. Patterson's fascinating story. Except at Plymouth British defensive preparations were, somewhat surprisingly, rather good but they remained untested. The Bourbon plan collapsed because the civilians responsible, Vergennes and Florida Blanca, failed to take professional seamen into their confidence, as Pitt had done, and technicalities which they overlooked destroyed their scheming. Yet one consequence, as Channing noted, was that, when Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown with 7,000 men, 70,000 British troops were guarding their native island: the need of an equivalent garrison in the somewhat analogous situation of 1899–1902 would have given all South Africa to Kruger. And an interesting point noticed by Patterson is the revival after Fashoda of French interest in their old invasion plans of the eighteenth century.

Both these books should be read by American and Canadian historians. Each author possesses thoroughness, good judgment, and, that queen of historical virtues, lucidity.

RICHARD GLOVER

University of Manitoba

*Burke, Disraeli, and Churchill: The Politics of Perseverance.* By STEPHEN R. GRAUBARD. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1961. Pp. x, 262. \$6.00.

THE PURPOSE OF DR. GRAUBARD'S STUDY of Burke, Disraeli, and Churchill, as stated in his Introduction, is to examine their published work in detail, keeping it always related to their political careers. Once we accept that purpose, perhaps no excuse is necessary for the absence of any reference to private papers, diaries, or memoirs. Nor will the reader question the author's intimate knowledge of the writings of his three subjects. In a separate essay on each man we are taken through his work, book by book, novel by novel, tract by tract. Each essay is comprehensive, but long before the end of the book is reached two questions keep recurring which leave the mind impatient because they go unanswered.

Why these three men? Why this method of study? In reply to the first question the author suggests that all three suffer from the label "Conservative." The term confines them, moulding them to our own presuppositions. He finds a more flexible common ground in the fact that each man was a critic or dissenter in his society and made his criticism articulate through a combination of literary production with active parliamentary politics. On the basis of this common ground the author justifies the inclusion of these particular men in a study which, he says, would rescue them from their Conservative disciples and give them meaning and significance as outstanding figures facing historically different conditions. The historian is likely to feel a certain sympathy with this aim, although remaining unconvinced that such a study will add "a new dimension" to British history since the mid-eighteenth century.

As for the method of the book, there is no doubt that the autonomy of each essay has certain advantages. It gives scope for description interspersed with insight: on Burke, for example, and his defence of religious toleration "not as a politician, but as a man concerned with justice and with the security of the state." There is the interesting suggestion that Disraeli's novel, *Sybil*, "would almost certainly never have been written if Peel had recognized Disraeli's services in 1841." On Churchill, too, Dr. Graubard brings out the man's nostalgia for government by oligarchy, his admiration for late Victorians like Morley and Balfour who maintained genuine intellectual interests while accepting high political responsibility. Insights like these ring true, but few readers are likely to find them new. And they are generally obscured by the chronological nature of the essays, with their lack of emphasis or selection. The narrative background of political events, most of them obvious, and the detailed accounts of plot or structure stifle the development of coherent interpretation. Given the difficulties of the subject, and the method chosen by the author, perhaps no conclusion or comparative treatment should have been expected. But the absence of both conclusion and of comparison leaves the reader convinced that while the studies were worth doing as intellectual exercises, their value to the historian or the political scientist is limited.

ALBERT V. TUCKER

University of Western Ontario

*Louis Blanc: His Life and His Contributions to French Jacobin-Socialism.* By LEO A. LOUBÈRE. Northwestern University Studies in History, I. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press. 1961. Pp. xii, 256. \$6.50.

THIS SOLID AND CAREFUL STUDY is primarily an assessment of Louis Blanc as thinker and political leader and only secondarily the story of his personal life.



Loubère attempts a more rounded study of Blanc than any now available. He recounts what is known of Blanc's life, analyses his ideas with commendable clarity and thoroughness, and attempts to indicate the effects of his public experiences on Blanc's thought. Loubère's wide reading is evident, but he makes no claim to have discovered significant new archival material.

The painstaking presentation of Blanc's ideas cannot be easily or justly summarized. Essentially Loubère sees Blanc as an exponent of Jacobin socialism, that is, the combination of democratic politics with socialist economics. Blanc's basic conviction was that the democratic state was the proper instrument to create the socialist economy. This insistence eventually isolated him from the main body of French labour, which, as a result of repeated disillusionment with successive governments, became increasingly non-political. At the same time, Blanc's consistent repudiation of violence separated him from the Marxists and many of the trade unionists. "The insurrectionary *mystique* proved to be the heaviest burden borne by the French labor movement. . . . It made impossible Blanc's lifelong mission, the separation of socialism from the bloody image of the Terror." (p. 227)

The interesting chapters on Blanc's political activities in 1848 are both sympathetic and critical. Forced to a certain amount of speculation about Blanc's motives—speculation which he is careful to distinguish from fact—Loubère concludes that Blanc was caught in a dilemma that his political skill was not great enough to meet. On the one hand he was genuinely unwilling to stir up violence to gain his ends, on the other hand he realized the necessity of coercing the Provisional Government if economic change was to be attained. Loubère's cool judgment is that as a politician Blanc was not impressive.

Particularly praiseworthy is the author's care to present Blanc as a part of the general evolution of socialist thought and the worker's movement in France. Blanc's life spanned most of the nineteenth century, so that any adequate account could scarcely escape being at least to some extent a history of the French labour movement. Loubère's book, while in no way pretentious, meets this challenge; the lucid discussion of different elements in the French socialist tradition accordingly gives the biography an added value. This reviewer's only qualification would be that the general context might well have been treated in fuller detail and drawn in somewhat bolder outline. Readers will find the style compact and precise, if seldom brilliant. The book requires, as it deserves, attentive reading.

LENORE O'BOYLE

Connecticut College  
New London, Conn.

*The Rise of the British Treasury: Colonial Administration in the Eighteenth Century.* By DORA MAE CLARK. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press [Montreal: McGill University Press]. 1960. Pp. x, 249. \$5.00.

FOR SOME TIME THE ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORIANS have been retelling the familiar story of the coming of the American Revolution as the account of the growth of central administrative agencies to rule the nation and the empire, a growth that was too slow to prevent the rise of competing, locally-oriented institutions in the colonies but sufficiently quick to precipitate a crisis. At the centre, a shadowy royal authority over the colonies was replaced by an almost ubiquitous executive dominated by the Treasury in consequence of its newly-acquired financial powers, the political leadership of its presiding officers, its function as the executive agent

of Parliament's regulation of trade, and the increasing demands upon the Exchequer to pay for colonial administration and defence.

Miss Clark has studied the elements of the subject intensively and evoked from a wealth of manuscript material many stimulating minor discoveries. Two shortcomings in the book—of orientation and organization—prevent these from being the basis of fruitful generalizations. Miss Clark's orientation is upon the application of Treasury policy to the colonies, not upon the institutions and principles from which the policies emerged. By neglecting such fundamental influences as the principle of personal accountability at the Exchequer and the practice of debt-funding, she leaves inexplicable a good many of the Treasury's failures and successes. She also becomes preoccupied with the now rather threadbare theme of the application of "traditional mercantilism" between 1763 and 1775 as a cause of the American Revolution, even to the extent of reviving the ideological stereotypes of Grenville, the narrow Treasury lawyer, and Rockingham, the wise liberal statesman, without much regard to the financial and political circumstances which directed the formulation of colonial policy in 1765 and 1766.

More serious is the book's chronological organization which, though it provides a progressive record of changes in Treasury policy, leads to fragmentation. In each chapter Miss Clark removes from its setting every cog of the Treasury machine, examines it in breathlessly contracted paragraphs, and puts it back in place, only to repeat the whole process in the next chapter. The effect—of disjointedness to the verge of incoherence—is not lightened by the author's unsophisticated style.

It is unfortunate that for these reasons the work will not have great use, will not be the badly-needed extension in the imperial field of the fine administrative studies of Dr. Baxter, Dr. Ward, and Dr. Binney.

JOHN NORRIS

University of British Columbia

*The White Rajahs: A History of Sarawak from 1841 to 1946.* By STEVEN RUNCIMAN. Cambridge: At the University Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1960. Pp. xii, 320. \$5.75.

JAMES BROOKE was an ensign in the Bengal army when he was wounded in the course of a campaign in Burma. During a lengthy convalescence in England he read avidly about the East, particularly the works of Raffles. Like his hero, he became inspired with a belief in the potentialities of the great islands that lay beyond the Indian subcontinent. He resigned his commission and in 1834 undertook an unsuccessful commercial voyage to the East. He tried again in 1838, his object this time being Borneo. When he arrived off the pirate-infested coast of Sarawak, the westernmost portion of the Sultanate of Brunei, it was to find the inhabitants in revolt against their ruler. He was invited to assist in suppressing the rebellion, and in return for his aid was invested with the sovereignty of Sarawak and granted the title of Rajah. The dynasty he founded in these novel circumstances lasted for more than one hundred years, the third Rajah—Vyner Brooke—ceding the state to the British Crown in 1946. By that time additional cessions of land by the Sultans of Brunei to the Rajahs of Sarawak had reduced the former's large territories to little more than the town of Brunei itself and the coastal districts around it. In this steady growth at the expense of its neighbours, usually in order to preserve law and order in the border regions, Sarawak represents in microcosm at least one aspect of the process of expansion in the great age of modern imperialism.

Sarawak was never the gold mine that James Brooke had envisaged. When his nephew, Charles Brooke, succeeded him in 1868 the country was in debt, though from 1877 to the Second World War it showed a profit. Moderate prosperity was aided by the discovery of oil and the introduction of new crops, such as rubber. But the Brooke family, to their credit, never looked upon their domain as one to be ruthlessly exploited, without regard to the welfare of the native inhabitants. As Charles Brooke (whose reign lasted nearly fifty years) put it in his will, the first Rajah when he founded the State of Sarawak "never entertained the idea of thereby founding a family of Brookes to be European millionaires."

Steven Runciman, a distinguished mediaeval historian, has written an authoritative and well-balanced account of this unconventional episode in nineteenth-century imperialism. The narrative is almost always interesting, though the numerous accounts of pirate-hunting expeditions are sometimes tedious. He has made use of a surprisingly wide variety of sources, while admitting that there are serious gaps. The fact that this work was commissioned by the Sarawak government enabled the author to make three visits to the country in the course of his researches. This undoubtedly adds to the atmosphere which the writer has captured and so successfully conveys. But the fact that this is an official history also explains the extreme caution with which Mr. Runciman handles the final episode in the history of the white rajahs—the cession of the territory to the British crown. The definitive history of that event, the author feels, will have to wait until the passage of time permits a clearer perspective.

P. HARNETTY

University of British Columbia

*Lloyd George*. By RICHARD LLOYD GEORGE. London: Frederick Muller Limited [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1960. Pp. 248. \$4.75.

THIS IS A VERY INSIGNIFICANT BOOK. Richard Lloyd George, the eldest son of Britain's Prime Minister in World War I, has recalled nothing of note that will be valued by historians. The second Earl appears to have written his recollections from memory alone without benefit of written records of any kind. Nor has he bothered to kindle his memory by consulting any of the numerous biographies and autobiographies of his father's contemporaries. What he has called back from the past is entirely personal. It is the kind of thing that makes interesting conversation—anecdotes and stories that centre on the personality and particular traits of his father and his friends. But to the many episodes in Lloyd George's career upon which the historian would wish fresh information, his son contributes nothing whatever.

The author and his publishers undoubtedly expect this book to enjoy a "succès de scandale." Its major ingredient and sole novelty is found in the author's recounting, in some detail and with full reference to a host of cases, the hitherto hidden record of Lloyd George's varied and long-sustained extramarital love life. Women were, we are told, his only form of recreation, a form he followed all his adult years with unflagging zest. Had he not lived thirty years too soon he would, it appears, have provided Professor Kinsey with a splendid specimen of over-achievement. That this story should be told by his own eldest son, however, is little less than amazing. It must give considerable pain and offence to other members of the Lloyd George family as well as to the relatives of women who are mentioned by name as wooed or won by the Welsh Wizard. The second Earl scarcely pretends to the usual excuse for revelations of this kind. At no point does

he endeavour to show that his father's "womanizing" had any effect upon his public career. His justification is rather that Lloyd George's habits created a continual family crisis and a constant threat to his political career from exposure and that the situation is therefore an element in the background of his public life which must be taken into account. Though the author was involved over a period of many years in the domestic tension and was consistently "an angry son," he deals with the matter here in a surprisingly detached and dispassionate spirit. Indeed, it appears in these pages that clinical tranquility does grow with age. The author now thinks of his father as a genius bedevilled by a physical handicap. For biographers to portray him without taking it into account would, he thinks, be equivalent to writing of Beethoven and failing to note his deafness. None the less, we note that Lloyd George disinherited both his eldest son and his eldest daughter. We are left to wonder what form Olwen's revenge will take.

H. W. McCREADY

McMaster University

*Modern Britain, 1885-1955.* By HENRY PELLING. A History of England edited by CHRISTOPHER BROOKE and DENIS MACK SMITH, VIII. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd. 1960. Pp. xii, 212. 18s.

*An Economic History of England, 1870-1939.* By WILLIAM ASHWORTH. An Economic History of England edited by T. S. ASHTON, V. London: Methuen and Co. Pp. x, 438. 36s.

*The British Economy, 1920-1957.* By A. J. YOUNGSON. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. [Toronto: Thomas Nelson & Sons (Canada) Ltd.]. 1960. Pp. 272. \$6.25.

MOST HISTORIANS ARE NATURALLY RELUCTANT to bring their studies too close to the present, as the normal sources begin to dry up and perspective becomes increasingly difficult. The latest editions of popular textbooks must, of course, have a chapter of contemporary history, but these are generally superficial surveys grudgingly made as a concession to the publishers. Yet in any discipline there will always be pioneers seeking new frontiers. In the 1930's the editors of the Oxford History of England probably thought they were being bold in bringing its last volume up to 1914 and it was not until 1956 that the first serious general history of Britain between the wars appeared. Today, however, 1939 is as far away as 1914 was in 1936 and the younger student may well begin to ask what has happened since then. When we are young history seems to consist of what happened before our own time, but as we grow older the tide of history begins to flow in over the beaches of our own memories. Moreover, it is a tide that never recedes and with the appearance of these books it has leapt forward to the 1950's and seems to be almost lapping at our feet.

Mr. Pelling is faced with the task of recounting what is surely one of the most significant and exciting seventy years in British history. What a field this is for the pioneer historian to plow, but it must be confessed that the results of Mr. Pelling's labours are disappointing. The book is informative to a point and clearly written, but it is as dull as an encyclopaedia article and as reserved in its opinions. In part the author may blame his publishers or general editors for allowing him too little space, for in his conscientious attempt to cover everything, which is not possible in so short a book, he is left unable to expand any theme in an interesting manner. The great personalities of the period, so important

in any such history, remain undeveloped, for the most part mere names. The attempt to be all-inclusive is self-defeating. Paragraphs on cultural development become mere catalogues. It would have been better to have covered such matters by allusion or not at all and to have used the space saved to develop other themes more fully. No general historian has ever devised a completely satisfactory way of combining or separating the varying themes that go to make up his story, but Mr. Pelling's rigid and artificial separation of topics in each chapter is particularly disconcerting. Thus since he insists on dealing with foreign and imperial affairs for a particular period before considering the political developments that produced the government responsible for making policy, we fight the Boer War before we hear of Gladstone's second Home Rule Bill, we reach the outbreak of the First World War before we hear of the Liberal revival of the previous decade, and later we are informed of the death of Ernest Bevin before we fairly get the Labour government into office. This approach may be all right for readers who know what happened but they will not need to read the book since it rarely goes beyond facts and develops no striking theses. Nevertheless for the time being it will serve some purpose since it is almost the only general history of Britain in the twentieth century. Ensor and Mowat remain the basic texts for their respective periods, but here is a book that summarizes their detail and carries the reader through the war years into the 1950's.

As a specialist the economic historian can avoid some of these pitfalls awaiting the general historian and his sources for writing recent history become available for the most part at an earlier date. It is true that Professor Ashworth does not venture beyond 1939 but Mr. Youngson very successfully penetrates the nineteen-fifties. Professor Ashworth's volume is painstakingly and systematically informative and will doubtless be a standard reference work in English economic history of the period for many years to come. The author is chary of generalizations and in the Clapham tradition prefers to allow the facts to speak for themselves. It is divided into three parts, the first, which is the best, covering the period 1870-1914 in ten chapters, the second consisting of two chapters on the First World War and its consequences, and the third covering the period 1919-1939 in five chapters. Agriculture; mining, manufacturing, and building; internal transport and trade; external trade; money, banking, and investment; and labour, which are treated separately in six chapters in part one, are compressed into two chapters in part three. In both parts there are also chapters on government policy and on the course and outcome of economic change for both periods.

The over-all picture of the period 1870-1914 is one of prosperity and economic progress, although there appears to be some slowing down of the economy after the turn of the century. While agriculture decreased greatly in relative importance during this period adaptation to new circumstances actually resulted in a slight increase of the gross agricultural product. British mining and manufacturing industries more than doubled their output during these years, while British exports increased about one hundred per cent in value and British foreign investment rose almost sixfold. The first scientific sociological surveys revealed the existence of widespread poverty, yet real incomes increased faster than ever before as national wealth increased at a rate of from 17 to 25 per cent per decade. Professor Ashworth finds some flaws in the British economy of the period, which was not expanding as rapidly as that of some other countries, but he considers it to have been basically sound and observes that "the country still maintained an immensely powerful and enviable economic position in the world and had the means to continue doing so."

In the inter-war years exports and foreign investment never regained their

pre-war level and British shipping tonnage was lower in 1939 than in 1914. Yet national income rose 40 per cent between 1914 and 1939 and the standard of living of the working classes, despite chronic unemployment, was much higher than in pre-war years. Indeed Ashworth is of the opinion that "many, perhaps most, unemployed families in the thirties had rather more purchasing power than those of unskilled labourers in Edwardian times."

Few of these facts are really new, but they are presented here with authority and in some detail and it is useful to have the post and pre-war years covered in the one book. The author illustrates his points with a wide range of statistical information and it is only a pity that he did not make these figures more complete by including some statistical appendices.

The publisher's description on the dust cover of Professor Youngson's book describes it as an economic history of Britain since 1920. Thus it overlaps Professor Ashworth's volume for the period between the wars, which it treats in approximately the same amount of space, but it makes no attempt at such a systematic and comprehensive account of economic activity as the former book. It is an easier and more interesting book to read, partly because it follows a more strictly chronological narrative and puts rather more emphasis on the over-all picture of the economy, partly because Professor Youngson is readier to express his views and does so in vigorous style. His outlook is similar to that of the *Economist* which he frequently quotes; indeed his authoritative tone and lucid prose are reminiscent of the commentary in that distinguished but anonymous journal. Professor Youngson devotes separate chapters to the nineteen-twenties and the nineteen-thirties which Professor Ashworth deals with as a unified period with a topical division of chapters. Moreover, Youngson devotes a whole chapter to the economic crisis of 1929-32 which Ashworth dismisses in a few pages. For the period up to 1939 Youngson, like Ashworth, is able to make good use of much published research and these chapters may be regarded as a valuable summing up of present knowledge. The stretch since 1939, which is dealt with in one chapter on the war economy and one on the period 1945-1957, is less well charted and the account presented here can only be regarded as an interim one. Nevertheless with this reservation it is an interesting contribution that will be of great value to students who want to bring the story up to the present.

Professor Youngson has divided this last period into three phases: 1945-47, the two years when "the British lived in a fool's paradise . . . nationalizing industries and inaugurating the Welfare State to the accompaniment of apathy, low productivity, shortages, suppressed inflation, and borrowing from abroad;" then four years of genuine if moderate progress (1947-51), when "productivity began to increase, exports soared, and Marshall Aid was pumped into western Europe;" and finally "the years of Tory socialism [1951-57] marked especially by the re-establishment of monetary control and gradually growing resistance to continued inflation." The whole period, however, he regards as one "of repeated if not of continual crisis," during which "Government economic policy assumed an importance such as it had never before possessed in peacetime." The layman may look back on the nineteen-fifties as a period of prosperity and full employment but the economic historian is more aware of this continued atmosphere of crisis and of the alarming rise of inflation, which increased 26 per cent from 1948 to 1952 and 14 per cent from 1952 to 1957. Youngson blames this on the tendency of all governments of the period to promote "excess monetary demand" as a guarantee against unemployment. "This meant inflation," he observes, "which caused social injustice and was always threatening the country's ability to earn its daily bread in foreign markets; but Government after Government gambled with social justice and national economic security for fear of a little more



unemployment." Finally, however, the crisis of 1957 led a new chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Thorneycroft, to take a firm stand by raising the bank rate to 7 per cent. Within a year prices had steadied and gold and dollar reserves had almost doubled, while employment and industrial output had contracted only slightly.

Professor Youngston lays some blame for the inflation on the new nationalized industries (coal, electricity, and railways) getting more than their share of investment capital but he does not condemn these measures of nationalization. "The whole programme," he recognizes, "made a big difference to the economy. Great improvements in these fundamental industries were made; the old sense of hopelessness and stagnation disappeared." He also grudgingly admits the success of the social security legislation enacted since 1945. "Security from cradle to grave," he says, "was perhaps too high a claim for it, and it was paradoxical, to say the least, that personal economic security was thus built up just at the time when national economic security was at a very low ebb; but in the judgment of most people these measures made Britain a better and freer society in which to live."

We may, perhaps, attribute Professor Youngston's underlying pessimism to his training in the "gloomy science." No doubt there have been flaws in Britain's postwar economy, but it is difficult for the lay historian to find any period in British history where the mass of the people appear to have been as well off and content as they have been in the past decade. It is impossible, however, to put so recent a period in proper historical perspective and it is probably safest for the historian to reserve his judgment for another generation.

J. B. CONACHER

University of Toronto

*The Baldwin Age.* Edited by JOHN RAYMOND. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode [Toronto: The Ryerson Press]. 1960. Pp. 248. \$5.00.

WHO WOULD WISH TO HAVE his name permanently linked with the 1920's and 1930's? The age is neither heroic enough nor creative enough for the honour to be sought; so, by default, it descends on the quiet unassuming man who lived at Number 10 Downing Street for seven of those years and spent another four as the principal Conservative minister in MacDonald's national government. *The Baldwin Age* is the work of fourteen authors interested in documenting the accomplishments as well as the failures of the period. Robert Blake, Bonar Law's biographer, contributes the principal essay, and his is the most successful piece. In forty pages he makes acute and judicious comments on Conservative politics in these years. By comparison, A. J. P. Taylor's shorter essay, "Confusion on the Left," is an occasional piece. Taylor's theme may be gauged from his conclusion where he writes: "Much can be said against the Left. They were romantic, idealistic, unworldly, often foolish. But one thing can be said in their favour. No one on the Left cared whom Edward VIII married, whether he married, when, or how often." Taylor's intention is to praise the Left; it does not occur to him that he may be offering further evidence of the Left's "confusion," possibly, even, of his own. Whom Edward married did matter; Baldwin, whatever else may be said against him, understood that.

The four essays on the arts, which are necessarily brief, offer little that is not more imaginatively stated in *The Long Week-End* by Robert Graves and Alan Hodge. On economic matters, the volume is conventional, replete with the usual

sort of vague references to the Keynesian revolution. C. P. Snow has written engagingly about Rutherford and what was accomplished in Cambridge when it was "the metropolis of physics for the entire world." It is a pity that John Raymond, the Editor, did not choose to contrast this achievement with others, and seek to explain the difference. We are left with fourteen opinions, rather redolent of the age—some are adequate; others scarcely pass muster.

STEPHEN R. GRAUBARD

Harvard University

*Mr. Carr of State: Forty-Seven Years in the Department of State.* By KATHARINE CRANE. New York: St. Martin's Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Ltd.]. 1960. Pp. 365. \$6.75.

MISS CRANE PRESENTS THIS BIOGRAPHY as an Horatio Alger story, but really the book is much better than that. Wilbur Carr was a career officer who spent most of his service from 1892 to 1939 trying to create order, standards, and professionalism in the Consular branch. The details of his quiet and persistent work are not spectacular, but they are of great interest. Clearly he was an unspectacular person, but from his papers and other public and private sources, Miss Crane has written a significant account of an administrative life. All this now seems incredibly gas-lit. The penury of the State Department is hardly to be believed. The ignorance of such Secretaries as Bryan ("an estimable man, with a kind and great heart . . . the most helpless mind that I have ever known when a definite opinion based upon facts is required") is still stunning. Much tittle-tattle brightens these pages (of Colonel House: "regarded seriously the first time he came but the second time people took him as a joke. Known here as Col Mouse."). We have Augustus Alvey Adey, Second Secretary of State, casually announcing at dinner that he has lost his private code books at sea. There is Mrs. Page again complaining *confidentially* that life at 6 Grosvenor Square is ruinous. There is Mrs. Hoover on Herbert Hoover ("Physically lazy. Never moves unless he must."). And there is more on the scramble in Cordell Hull's department, with Welles and Moore squaring off, and always F.D.R. smiling down from the throne at one and all ("Don't go, Wilbur. Wait until the others have gone."). In a short review it is impossible to do justice to this useful book. Carr was no Horatio Alger, but his work was of considerable importance. And this book makes clear what it was.

JOHN C. CAIRNS

University of Toronto

## Noted

*Canada's Soldiers: The Military History of an Unmilitary People.* Revised edition. By G. F. G. STANLEY in collaboration with H. M. JACKSON. Maps by C. C. J. BOND. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Ltd. 1960. Pp. xiv, 449, maps. \$7.50.

THIS IS A MOST WELCOME REVISION of the standard work on Canadian military history. The 1954 edition was in a sense a pre-war volume, for the author was

content with a short treatment of the 1945-54 period. In this revision, however, he has added a substantial body of material on the period since 1919, making use of the new evidence for that time, and has also expanded the chapter on the First War. The publisher has added a number of excellent illustrations as a centre-piece which, with a readable type and Major Bond's clear maps, enhance the general attractiveness of the book.

*The Arthur Papers: Being the Canadian Papers Mainly Confidential, Private, and Demi-Official of Sir George Arthur, K.C.H., in the Manuscript Collection of the Toronto Public Libraries. III. April 1840-June 1850 and Index.* Edited by C. R. SANDERSON. Toronto: Toronto Public Libraries and University of Toronto Press. 1959. Pp. viii, 603. \$10.00.

THIS VOLUME COMPLETES a large and important publishing project, begun nearly twenty years ago under the editorship of the late C. R. Sanderson, the progress of which has been noticed several times in the *Review*. It covers the months from April, 1840, to March, 1841, when Sir George Arthur left Canada, and it also includes some letters pertaining to Canadian affairs extending down to 1850. Privately, Arthur disapproved of the tendency of much of Sydenham's policy, but he continued to give him loyal and useful support in preparing the way for the Union. His final contribution was to stay on, at Sydenham's urgent request, for several weeks after the proclamation of the Union to help in the transition. Despite a certain grudging admiration of Sydenham's ability in managing men and affairs, Arthur had little sympathy for the new face of Canadian politics, and was obviously glad to leave the country.

In addition, and of particular value, a comprehensive index to the whole series is included in this final volume.

*Speeches of Angus L. Macdonald.* With a biographical note by the Hon. T. A. CRESSER and a Foreword by the Hon. J. L. ILSLEY. Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company. 1960. Pp. xxviii, 227. \$5.50.

ALREADY ANGUS L. MACDONALD is assured of an eminent position among the great modern Nova Scotians, whose contribution was made in both provincial and federal politics and who, somehow, seemed to embody the spirit of his province. Twenty speeches, no matter how carefully chosen, can do little more than provide a glimpse of the man. Macdonald's speeches were exceptionally readable and a useful purpose will have been served if they stimulate some readers to probe more deeply into the public career.

*Sails of the Maritimes: The Story of the Three- and Four-masted Cargo Schooners of Atlantic Canada, 1859-1929.* By JOHN P. PARKER. Halifax: The Maritime Museum of Canada. 1960. Pp. 226, illus. \$5.00.

AN EXTREMELY HANDSOME VOLUME which should be a delight to naval historians. Equally important, however, is its value as a first-rate reference work for those concerned with the economic history of the maritime provinces. Mr. Parker has collected a vast amount of material, yet has written a fresh and engaging volume on the ships and shipping of the Atlantic coast.

*English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century.* By BERYL SMALLEY. Oxford: Basil Blackwell [Toronto: Copp Clark Publishing Co. Ltd.]. 1960. Pp. xvi, 398, illus. \$9.00.

MISS SMALLEY HAS DESCRIBED the lives and work of seven forgotten men—Bible commentators with a taste for the Latin classics, who were contemporaries of Petrarch and the earlier Humanists, but somehow never managed to become Humanists themselves. She has regretfully to chronicle a dead end of intellectual history, a subject, one might well suppose, of no conceivable interest to any but the most recondite of specialists. As a matter of fact the book has, potentially, a much wider appeal; it is unlikely to be issued in a paperback edition, but it raises questions of importance to the mediaeval and Renaissance fields broadly considered and makes surprisingly few demands on the reader's erudition. It could be enjoyed, and very largely understood, by a reader who could not translate the Latin quotations. For those whose interest is more technical the work supplies a valuable discussion of what Petrarchan Humanism was and was not and helps to place the more conspicuous achievements of the age against their general intellectual background.

*A Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States.* Compiled for the National Historical Publications Commission. Edited by PHILIP M. HAMMER. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press [Montreal: McGill University Press]. 1961. Pp. xxiv, 775. \$12.50.

THIS IS A MONUMENTAL VOLUME which no reference library and few North American historians can afford not to have. The contributors have listed every archives in the United States with a brief statement of their holdings. More than 1300 archives and 20,000 collections are included. A thorough and lengthy index of 132 pages gives ready reference to the papers of individuals, corporations, and societies. Such a volume for Canada might well have considerable priority among the official publications commemorating Confederation.

*The Anglo-American Relationship since 1783.* By H. C. ALLEN. London: Adam & Charles Black [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Ltd.]. 1959. Pp. 247. \$3.50.

THIS BOOK is a "revised and enlarged edition" of Part I of the author's *Great Britain and the United States*, first published in 1954. The revision has been very slight, but a new twenty-nine page chapter entitled "Anglo-American Relations" is evidently intended to summarize and, for the purposes of this edition, replace Parts II, III, and IV of the larger book. A new list of abbreviations provides for references to the *Canadian Historical Review* and its American and English counterparts, none of which however appears to be cited in the present volume.

*A Study in Austrian Intellectual History: From Late Baroque to Romanticism.* By ROBERT A. KANN. New York: Frederick A. Praeger. 1960. Pp. xxii, 367, illus. \$6.00.

AN UNUSUAL AND SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT BOOK, written in a manner too little English and too much German, this series of essays is profound and thought-

provoking. Ostensibly the purpose is to illustrate the cyclical character of intellectual history in general, and there is much talk of pendulums and friction at the outset and at the close. One can take that as one will: it may be important. But as a study in Austrian history, with special emphasis upon two figures (Abraham a Sancta Clara (1646-1709) and Joseph von Sonnenfels (1732-1817)) who are used to sum up and typify the deep forces at work in the State, Mr. Kann's work is obviously significant. Quite apart from its value for an understanding of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it offers a fascinating explanation of the imminent tragedy of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century Habsburg empire. And it ties up with the author's monumental (and far better written) *The Multi-national Empire*. Erudite and solid, it easily rises above a sometimes unhappily negative and tentative style and will obviously repay careful re-reading.

*The Character of American History*. By W. R. BROCK. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1960. Pp. xii, 294. \$4.25.

W. R. BROCK OF CAMBRIDGE, who has twice done the University junket in America, has written a book which he says is chiefly for those with no previous knowledge of American history but which he hopes has "some of the merits of professional history." Unfortunately this gracefully written book seems to fall between two stools—it has neither the factual information (nor dullness) of a good textbook, nor does it offer any particular original interpretation of the American experience. Still there are several stimulating and perceptive chapters, particularly the one somewhat grandiosely entitled "The Evolution of a Liberal Capitalist Civilization." Like many Europeans of a conservative persuasion, Brock sees the lack of a ruling class as one of America's chief weaknesses, though he never makes the mistake of judging American politics against a false English standard. The interpretation of well-known events is fairly standard, although the author's judgments have an admirable detachment rarely achieved by American writers. Though never explicit about his essential interpretation of the over-all character of American history, the author is, on balance, an admirer of the past and an optimist about the future of the American way—here he differs from most of his nineteenth-century predecessors.

*British Conservatism, 1832-1914*. By R. B. McDOWELL. London: Faber and Faber [Toronto: British Book Service (Canada) Limited]. 1959. Pp. 191. \$5.00.

ADOPTING A NARRATIVE APPROACH, Dr. McDowell gives some account of the main issues that faced British Conservatism in the years 1830-1914. Inevitably he covers much familiar ground, but he produces a useful and well-informed, if unexciting, survey of the subject. He dwells on the usual ingredients of conservatism: patriotism becoming imperialistic; preoccupation with the rights of private property, tempered by some vague aspirations toward social justice; defence of the *status quo*, modified by a certain readiness to temporize on grounds of political expediency. It is an honest, uninspiring analysis of English Conservatism, but it ignores some questions that need attention. For instance no attempt is made to justify, condemn, or explain the extraordinary attitude of British Conservatives in challenging the constitution and the rule of law during the Irish crisis. Dr. McDowell is most illuminating in discussing the points of view of Conservative

newspapers and periodicals and of minor Conservative publicists, who remain shadowy figures in the general history of the period. Individually many of these writers and propagandists may be unimportant, but collectively they help to develop a genuine Conservative tradition with all its warts, and this Dr. McDowell successfully succeeds in reflecting.

## History Paperbacks

### ORIGINALS

- D. J. Boorstin, *America and the Image of Europe: Reflections on American Thought* (Meridian)  
 Alfred Cobban, *A History of Modern France. II. From the First Empire to the Fourth Republic 1799-1945* (Penguin)  
 G. R. Cragg, *The Church and the Age of Reason, 1648-1789* (Penguin)  
 Jean Imbert, *Le Droit Antique* (Presses Universitaires de France)  
 Jacques Néré, *La Guerre de Sécession* (Presses Universitaires de France)  
 D. E. Saunders, *The Autobiography of Gibbon* (Meridian)  
 Aubrey de Sélincourt, *Livy: The Early History of Rome* (Penguin)  
 Peter Viereck, *Metapolitics: The Roots of the Nazi Mind*. Being a revised and enlarged edition of *Metapolitics: From the Romantics to Hitler*, with a new prefatory essay on the Bonn Republic (based on the author's current travels in Germany), up-to-date supplements on Alfred Rosenberg and on bibliography, and a new Appendix of unpublished Thomas Mass material (Capricorn)  
 Gaston Willoquet, *Histoire des Philippines* (Presses Universitaires de France)  
 Harvey Wish, *Ante Bellum: Writings of George Fitzhugh and Hinton Rowan Helper on Slavery* (Capricorn)

### DOCUMENTS AND COLLECTIONS

- R. A. Divine, *American Foreign Policy* (Meridian)  
 N. A. Glatzer, *Jerusalem and Rome: The Writings of Josephus* (Meridian)  
 Arthur Hertzberg, *The Zionist Ideal: A Historical Analysis and Reader* (Meridian)  
 M. R. Kinvitz and Gail Kennedy, *The American Pragmatists* (Meridian)  
 Walter Lord, *The Fremantle Diary* (Capricorn)  
 J. R. Marcus, *The Jew in the Medieval World: A Source Book, 1314-1791* (Meridian)  
 J. P. Mayer, *The Recollections of Alexis de Tocqueville* (Meridian)  
 Clinton Rossiter, *The Federalist Papers* (Mentor)  
 H. T. Lefler, *A History of the United States from the Age of Exploration to 1865* (Meridian)

### REPRINTS (often with new introductions and notes)

- J. E. Acton, *Lectures on Modern History* (Meridian)  
 Henry Adams, *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres* (Mentor)  
 Herschel Baker, *The Image of Man* (Harper Torchbooks)  
 C. A. Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (Macmillan)  
 A. A. Berle, *The 20th Century Capitalist Revolution* (Harvest)



- Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (Mentor)  
 Joseph Charles, *The Origins of the American Party System* (Harper Torchbooks)  
 Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millenium* (Harper Torchbooks)  
 A. P. Davies, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Mentor)  
 Samuel Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire* (Meridian)  
 Simon Dubnov, *Nationalism and History* (Meridian)  
 William Ebenstein, *Today's ISMS: Communism, Fascism, Capitalism, Socialism* (Prentice-Hall)  
 Solomon Grayzel, *A History of the Contemporary Jews from 1900 to the Present* (Meridian)  
 Edith Hamilton, *Mythology: Timeless Tales of Gods and Heroes* (Mentor)  
 T. L. Jarman, *The Rise and Fall of Nazi Germany* (Signet)  
 P. O. Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic and Humanist Strains* (Harper Torchbooks)  
 Stefan Lorant, *The Life of Abraham Lincoln* (Mentor)  
 Ferdinand Lot, *The End of the Ancient World and the Beginnings of the Middle Ages* (Harper Torchbooks)  
 A. O. Lovejoy, *Essays in the History of Ideas* (Capricorn)  
 Robert Michels, *Political Parties* (Dover)  
 Theodor Mommsen, *The History of Rome* (Meridian)  
 B. L. Montgomery, *The Memoirs of Field-Marshal Montgomery* (Signet)  
 H. J. Muller, *The Loom of History* (Mentor)  
 Gustavus Myers, *History of Bigotry in the United States* (Capricorn)  
 J. E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth I* (Pelican)  
 J. H. Parry, *The Establishment of the European Hegemony 1415-1715: Trade and Exploration in the Age of the Renaissance* (Harper Torchbooks)  
 W. H. Prescott, *The Conquest of Peru* (Mentor)  
 Steven Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers* (Pelican)  
 Clinton Rossiter, *The American Presidency* (Harvest)  
 Percy Sykes, *A History of Exploration* (Harper Torchbooks)  
 J. A. Symonds, *The Renaissance in Italy. I. The Age of the Despots; II. The Revival of Learning* (Capricorn)  
 Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society 1780-1950* (Pelican)  
 W. B. Wood and J. S. Edmonds, *Military History of the Civil War* (Capricorn)

## Graduate Theses in Canadian History and Related Subjects

THE *Canadian Historical Review* presents herewith its thirty-fourth annual list of graduate theses which are in course of preparation or have recently been completed. Included in the list are titles not only in Canadian history but also in such related subjects as Canada's external relations, Canadian economics, law, and geography, and a selection of historical titles which bear indirectly rather than directly on Canadian history.

We wish to express our appreciation of the generous co-operation which we have received from a large number of universities throughout the Commonwealth, the United States, and Canada, in the compilation of this information. We shall be very grateful to have mistakes or omissions drawn to our attention.

### Theses for the Doctor's Degree

- F. H. ARMSTRONG, B.A. Toronto 1949; M.A. 1951. History of the city of Toronto, 1834-50. *Toronto*.
- BENJAMIN BARG, B.A. Sydney 1952; M.B.A. Harvard 1958; Ph.D. Columbia 1960. A study of United States control in Canadian secondary industry. *Columbia*.
- MILTON F. BAUER, B.A. Western Ontario 1947; M.A. Toronto 1949. The Credit Union movement in the province of Quebec. *Chicago*.
- A. B. M. BELL, B.A. Queen's 1935; M.A. 1935. The office of the governor general in the twentieth century. *Toronto*.
- B. C. BICKERTON, B.A. Acadia 1952; M.A. 1954. Scots emigration to British North America, 1837-1852. *Cambridge*.
- H. H. BINHAMMER, B.A. Western Ontario 1948; M.A. Queen's 1957; Ph.D. McGill 1961. A study of the Residential Construction Sector in the Canadian economy. *McGill*.
- G. A. BISHOP, B.A. New Brunswick 1941; M.A. Queen's 1942; M.A. Toronto 1946; Ph.D. 1961. Debt management as an instrument of compensatory policy in Canada, 1946-1960. *Toronto*.
- M. BLANAR, M.A. Loyola. Canada as seen by British travellers in the 18th century. *London*.
- JOSEPH A. BOUDREAU, B.A. U.C.L.A. 1956; M.A. 1958. The Canadian War-time Elections Act of 1917. *U.C.L.A.*
- D. BOUSQUET, B.A. McGill 1948; M.A. 1951; Ph.D. 1953. Henri Bourassa and the evolution of Anglo-Canadian relations, 1899-1931. *Cambridge*.
- WILBUR FEE BOWKER, B.A. Alberta 1930; LL.B. 1932; LL.M. Minnesota 1953. Reception of English law in Canada. *Yale*.
- CHANDLER BRACDON, B.A. Cambridge 1931; M.A. 1934; Ph.D. 1961. Canadian reactions to the foreign policy of the United States, 1934-9. *Rochester*.
- R. C. BROWN, B.A. Rochester 1957; M.A. Toronto 1958. Canadian-American relations in the latter part of the nineteenth century. *Toronto*.
- G. P. BROWNE. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and the distribution of legislative powers in the British North America Act, 1867. *Oxford*.
- MEYER BROWNSTONE, B.S. Manitoba 1945; M.S. Minnesota 1946; Dr.P.A. Harvard 1961. Farm income—a study in agricultural policy. *Harvard*.

- A. A. BURNETT, B.Sc. McGill 1955; M.A. 1956. Financing municipal government in Canada. *McGill*.
- K. J. CABLE, B.A. Sydney 1950; M.A. 1952; B.A. Cambridge 1954. Church, state, and university in the British empire, 1783-1860: a study of the foundation of universities in the British colonies of settlement. *Cambridge*.
- LOVELL C. CLARK, B.A. Queen's 1949; M.A. 1950. The eclipse of Canadian Conservatism, 1891-1901. *Toronto*.
- EDWARD COLLINS, Jr., Ph.D. Emory University 1960. The Commonwealth, Communism, and colonialism: A comparative study of Commonwealth foreign policies in the United Nations. *Emory*.
- ROBERT LYONS COMEAU, B.A. St. Francis Xavier 1947; M.A. 1952. Financial intermediaries as a factor in monetary instability: The Canadian case.
- BROOKE CORNWALL, B.A. British Columbia 1949; M.A. 1952. The geographical regions of the Canadian cordillera. *Clark*.
- HARRY SHERMAN CROWE, B.A. Manitoba 1947; M.A. Toronto 1948. The state and economic life in Canada. *Columbia*.
- PAUL E. CRUNICAN, B.A. Western Ontario 1948; M.A. Toronto 1956. The Manitoba Schools question and Canadian federal politics. *Toronto*.
- R. STANLEY CUMMING, B.A. Dalhousie; M.A. McGill. The timber trade between Great Britain and the Canadian Maritime Provinces, 1809-54. *Oxford*.
- MARCEL G. DAGENAIS, B.A. Jean de Brébeuf 1952; M.A. Montréal 1958; M.A. Yale 1960. The supply of newsprint in North America. *Yale*.
- ROBERT A. DAVIS, B.A. Toronto 1948; M.A. Syracuse 1950. The Mississauga corridor: A study of the special arrangement of central places in the southern part of the province of Ontario. *Clark*.
- GRANT R. DAVY, B.A. Western Ontario 1949; A.M. Fletcher School 1950. Canadian policy on disarmament, 1945-55. *Fletcher School*.
- WARREN H. DONNELLY, B.S. Queen's College 1942; M.P.A. New York 1953. Atomic energy and government in the United States, Great Britain, and Canada. *New York*.
- JOHN F. EARL, B.A. Western Ontario 1950; M.A. 1952. Analysis of post-war Canadian trade with Western Europe. *Clark*.
- LAURENCE SIDNEY FALLIS, Jr., A.B. Michigan 1959; A.M. 1960. The idea of nationalism in Canadian thought: 1867-1914. *Michigan*.
- D. F. FORSTER, B.A. Toronto 1956; A.M. Harvard 1958. Origins and development of Canadian combines policy. *Harvard*.
- ALLAN M. FRASER, M.A. Edinburgh 1928. History of Newfoundland from the suspension of Dominion status to unity with Canada. *Columbia*.
- BARBARA J. L. FRASER, B.A. Toronto 1955; M.A. 1959. The office of the governor general, 1867-1898. *Toronto*.
- M. G. FRY, B.Sc. London 1956. Anglo-American-Canadian relations, with special reference to Far Eastern and naval issues, 1918-22. *London*.
- T. GOLDBERG, B.A. Buffalo 1949; M.A. 1950. Health benefits through collective bargaining in Canadian industries. *Toronto*.
- JOHN F. GRAHAM, B.A. British Columbia; A.M. Columbia; Ph.D. 1959. Provincial-municipal fiscal relations and economic development in a low-income province: Nova Scotia. *Columbia*.
- SAUL W. GREY, A.B. Brooklyn College 1952; A.M. Fletcher School 1955. Canada and NATO: A study of one country's approach to collective security. *Fletcher School*.
- B. E. HANDREN. British public opinion and national policy, 1812-1815, on American issues, with special reference to treaties of peace and commerce with the United States. *Edinburgh*.
- E. A. HASLETT, B.S.A. Ontario Agricultural College 1949; M.S.A. Toronto 1953. The role of agriculture in the economy of Ontario. *Toronto*.
- G. J. HÉBERT, B.A. Montréal 1942; Lic. Phil. College of Immaculate Conception 1947; Lic. Theol. 1954. The juridical extension of collective agreements in the Quebec construction industry. *McGill*.
- WELF H. HEICK, B.A. Western Ontario 1953. A study in Canadian politics: Career and administration of Alexander Mackenzie. *Duke*.

- GERALD K. HELLEINER, B.A. Toronto 1958; M.A. Yale 1960. Some aspects of ties between Canadian and United States capital markets, 1952-60. *Yale*.
- BRUCE W. HODGINS, B.A. Western Ontario 1953; M.A. Queen's 1955. The career and administrations of John Sandfield Macdonald: A study in Canadian politics. *Duke*.
- C. W. HUMPHRIES, B.A. McMaster 1955; M.A. Toronto 1959. Sir James Whitney. *Toronto*.
- R. HYAM. The change of government in 1905 and its connection with British foreign and imperial policy. *Cambridge*.
- WILLIAM A. JENKINS, B.S. Macdonald College 1942; M.S. Cornell 1947; M.P.A. Harvard 1958. Land use study-Digby County, Nova Scotia. *Harvard*.
- ALBERT W. JOHNSON, B.A. Saskatchewan 1942; M.A. Toronto 1945; M.P.A. Harvard 1950. Government planning in Saskatchewan, 1944-1960. *Harvard*.
- JAMES DONALD JOHNSON, B.A. Jamestown College 1950; A. M. North Dakota 1952; A.M. Michigan 1957. Pressure groups in the Canadian House of Commons. *Michigan*.
- ROBERT A. JOHNSTON, B.Com. Toronto 1956. An analysis of the Canadian floating discount rate and its implications for monetary policy. *Yale*.
- R. S. JORDAN, D.Phil. Oxford 1960. A study of the role of the International Staff/Secretariat of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization during the tenure of Lord Ismay as Secretary General. *Oxford*.
- ROBERT DALE JUDY, A.B. Kansas 1948; M.A. 1950; Ph.D. California 1959. Territorial government: The Canadian Northwest Territories and the Yukon. *California*.
- A. W. LANE, B.A. McGill 1947. The transportation policies of the federal government during the 1920's. *McGill*.
- LAURIER L. LAPIERRE, B.A. Toronto 1955; M.A. 1957. The career of Joseph Israel Tarte. *Toronto*.
- ALAN HARVEY LAWRENCE, Ph.D. Minnesota 1960. The influence of British ideas in the British North American revolution. *Minnesota*.
- PERRY EUGENE LEROY, Ph.D. Ohio State 1960. Sir Guy Carleton as a military leader during the American invasion and repulse in Canada, 1775-1776. *Ohio State*.
- LOUIS LIPPETT, B.S. City College, New York 1947; M.A. Columbia 1953; Ph.D. 1959. Statistical analysis of regional facies change in ordovica Cobourg limestone in north-western New York and southern Ontario. *Columbia*.
- JAMES P. LOVEKIN, B.A. Toronto 1946; M.A. 1949; B.Ed. 1954. A study of a typical Ontario community, Durham County. *Queen's*.
- H. IAN MACDONALD, B.Com. Toronto 1952; B.A. Oxford 1954; B.Phil. 1955; M.A. 1958. Foreign investment in Canada since 1926. *Oxford*.
- MALCOLM MACDONELL, B.A. St. Francis Xavier 1938; M.A. Toronto 1945. The administration of Sir John Harvey-Newfoundland, 1841-6. *Toronto*.
- JOSEPH E. MCGURN, A.B. Hobart 1950; M.A. 1951. Canadian opinion about United States foreign policy 1914-20. *Rochester*.
- M. A. MCINTYRE. West Indian trade with Canada: a case study of preferential arrangements, with special reference to the years 1947-56. *Oxford*.
- B. K. MACLAURY, A.B. Princeton 1953; A.M. Harvard 1958; Ph.D. 1961. The Canadian money market, its development and its impact. *Harvard*.
- R. A. MACLEAN, B.A. St. Francis Xavier 1949; M.A. Alberta 1958. Joseph Howe and Canadian Confederation. *Toronto*.
- RONALD STUART MACLEAN, B.Sc. Alberta 1949; B.Ed. 1950; A. M. Fletcher School 1953. British, top-level personal diplomacy in two wartime coalitions: A comparison. *Fletcher School*.
- W. J. MACLEAN, B.A. McMaster 1959; M.A. 1961. The C.P.R. in Canadian politics. *Toronto*.
- MARY E. McNAB, B.A. Toronto 1948; M.A. 1949. Naval problems of Laurier and Borden, 1910-12. *Toronto*.
- H. MACQUARRIE, B.A. Manitoba 1947; M.A. New Brunswick 1949. Sir Robert Borden and the Conservative party. *McGill*.
- HARRY RICHARD MAHOOD, Ph.D. Illinois 1960. The St. Lawrence Seaway bill of 1954: A case study of decision-making in American foreign policy. *Illinois*.

- RALPH DONALD MICHENER, B.A. Manitoba 1947; M.A. Toronto 1951. Degree-granting provincial institutions of higher education in Canada: An historical study. *New York*.
- J. MOHAN, B.A. Agra 1954; M.A. 1956. The Suez crisis and the Commonwealth. *Toronto*.
- JACQUES MONET, B.A. Montréal 1955; M.A. Toronto 1961. French-Canadian loyalism, 1849-67. *Toronto*.
- A. MILTON MOORE, B.A. Queen's 1949; A.M. Chicago 1951. The pricing of Crown timber in eastern Canada. *Chicago*.
- JOHN DUNCAN MUNDIE, B.Com. Manitoba 1954; M.B.A. Ohio State 1955. Resale price maintenance and its effect upon marketing in Canada. *Stanford*.
- ALEXANDER L. MURRAY, B. A. McMaster 1953; M.A. London 1955; Ph.D. Pennsylvania 1960. Canada and the Anglo-American anti-slavery movement: A study in international philanthropy. *Pennsylvania*.
- D. J. MURRAY. The Colonial Office and the plantation of colonies, 1801-34; A study of imperial government in evolution. *Oxford*.
- J. W. O'BRIEN, B.A. McGill 1953; M.A. 1955. Public and privately owned telephone systems: An economic comparison. *McGill*.
- HERMAN OLAF JOHAN OVERGAARD, B.A. Manitoba 1944; M.S. Columbia 1950; Ph.D. 1960. Water problems in southwestern Ontario. *Columbia*.
- E. PALMER PATTERSON II, B.A. Baylor 1948; M.A. Kansas 1953. Andrew Paull and Indian resurgence. *Washington* (Seattle).
- H. C. PENTLAND, B.A. Manitoba 1940; M.A. Oregon 1942; Ph.D. Toronto 1961. Labour in Canada in the early 19th century. *Toronto*.
- J. PICKETT. Canadian international trade, 1867-1957. *Glasgow*.
- JOHN ALEXIS PINCUS, A. B. Colby College 1948; A.M. Columbia 1950. Primary industry and the economic development of Canada. *Harvard*.
- JOHN E. PINNINGTON, B.A. Anglican reaction to the challenge of a multi-confessional society with special reference to the colonies, 1760-1850. *Oxford*.
- ALAN R. PLOTNICK, B.A. Temple 1949; M.A. Pennsylvania 1951; Ph.D. 1960. Economic and commercial policy aspects of marketing western Canadian petroleum in Canada and the United States. *Pennsylvania*.
- S. L. POLLARD, B.A. McGill 1929; M.A. 1930; L.Th. Montreal Diocesan College 1932. The Episcopate of Bishop Francis Fulford of Montreal, 1850-67. *McGill*.
- T. L. POWRIE. B.S.A. Saskatchewan 1954; M.A. 1955; B.Phil. Oxford 1957. Some aspects of the Canadian balance of payments, 1950 to 1958, with special reference to the mechanism of adjustment. *Oxford*.
- KENNETH GEORGE PRYKE, B.A. Carleton 1956; A.M. Duke 1958. Nova Scotia and Confederation to 1872. *Duke*.
- J. D. PURDY, B.A. New Brunswick 1953; M.A. Toronto 1954. John Strachan and education in Canada. *Toronto*.
- RONALD RADOSH, B.A. Wisconsin 1959; M.A. Iowa 1960. Canada: A case study in the relationship between economics and politics in American diplomacy. *Wisconsin*.
- S. PETER REGENSTREIF, B.A. McGill 1957. The Liberal party of Canada, 1896-1957. *Cornell*.
- WILLIAM OLIVER RICHMOND, B.S. Alberta 1957. Middle Devonian Reef study, Great Slave Lake, Northwest Territories, Canada. *Stanford*.
- S. J. ROGERS, B.A. London and Toronto. The philosophical background to the development of educational practices and principles in the schools of Quebec. *Western Ontario*.
- ERIC D. ROSS, B.A. New Brunswick 1951; M.A. 1954. Historical geography of exploration and fur trade in the Canadian Northwest, 1770-1821. *Edinburgh*.
- VALERIE J. ROSS, M.A. McGill 1957. Economic and social factors influencing the Selkirk migration to Canada. *McGill*.
- REGINALD H. ROY, B.A. British Columbia 1950; M.A. 1951. The British Columbia Dragoons and its predecessors. *Washington* (Seattle).
- CHARLES SCHUETZ, B.A. Ottawa 1953; M.A. 1956. The party system—the fundamental institution of Canadian democracy. *Ottawa*.

- RONALD A. SHEARER, B.A. British Columbia 1954; M.A. Ohio State 1955. The impact of post-war private international investment on the development of the Canadian economy. *Ohio State*.
- E. C. SIEVWRIGHT, B.Sc. London 1950. Impact of the oil industry on the economy of Alberta. *McGill*.
- G. GADDIS SMITH, B.A. Yale 1954; M.A. 1958; Ph.D. 1961. Nation and empire: Canadian diplomacy during the First World War. *Yale*.
- WILLIAM DAVID SMITH, B.A. Manitoba 1948; A.M. Harvard 1949. Sir Robert Borden and Union government, 1917-21. *Toronto*.
- H. A. STEVENSON, B.A. Western Ontario 1958; M.A. Toronto 1960. Social conditions in Upper Canada, 1848-67. *Toronto*.
- J. I. STEWART, B.A. Toronto 1935; M.Com. 1957; M.A. 1960. An economic analysis of the principles and procedures of valuation of real property in Canada. *Toronto*.
- ARTHUR GEORGE STOREY, B.A. Saskatchewan 1947; M.A. 1948; Ph.D. Stanford 1960. A reading comprehension test for junior high school pupils in Alberta. *Stanford*.
- GILLIAN M. TOWNSEND, B.A. Liverpool 1959. The English in Newfoundland, 1580-1660. *Liverpool*.
- H. E. TURNER, B.A. McMaster 1956; M.A. Toronto 1959. The Church of England in central Canada in the nineteenth century. *Toronto*.
- D. C. TWAY, A. B. Bluffton 1941; A. M. New York 1946. Hudson's Bay Company land policies, 1870-1930. *California* (Los Angeles).
- WALTER ULLMANN, B.A. British Columbia 1954; M.A. 1956; Ph.D. Rochester 1961. The Quebec bishops and Confederation. *Rochester*.
- JAMES D. WAHN, B.S. Saskatchewan 1942; M.S. 1947. The Canadian capital inflow, 1950-4. *Chicago*.
- HUGH WALLACE, B.A. Alberta 1941; M.A. Toronto 1948. Canada's relations with India, 1945-1960. *Rochester*.
- R. WALLS. Scottish influences in Nova Scotia—religion, education, and politics. *Edinburgh*.
- J. P. WARNER, B.Sc. London 1948; M.A. Alberta 1960; The possibilities of further manufacturing Canada's mineral products. *Toronto*.
- ROSS A. WEBB. The mechanization of transport in Nova Scotia, 1825-1867. *Pittsburgh*.
- JOHN ROBERT WESTLAKE, B.A. Alberta 1942; LL.B. 1943. Canadian labour law. *Yale*.
- DOUGLAS POE WEYLAND, Ph.D. Indiana 1959. Local sales taxes in the United States and Canada. *Indiana*.
- WALTER LEROY WHITE, B.A. Western Ontario 1951; M.A. Toronto 1952. The Liberal Party of Canada in the twentieth century. *Michigan*.
- HAROLD A. WILSON, B.A. Iowa 1950; M.A. 1952. Borden, imperial statesman. *Iowa*.
- S. F. WISE, B.A. Toronto 1949; B.L.S. 1950; M.A. Queen's 1953. Canadian Toryism, a study in "ideology." *Queen's*.
- KENNETH NEVILLE WINDSOR, B.A. Western Ontario 1955. The career of George Munro Grant. *Toronto*.
- IVOR PETERSON WOLD, Ph.D. Texas 1960. Economic change in Canada, pre-war to recent, emphasizing aggregates. *Texas*.
- ROBERT E. WYNNE, Ju.D. Vienna 1936; B.Ed. Alberta 1954; M.A. 1958. Popular reaction to oriental immigration in the State of Washington and in British Columbia. *Washington* (Seattle).
- W. D. YOUNG, B.A. British Columbia 1955; B.A. Oxford 1957. The C.C.F. party in Canada. *Toronto*.
- ALOIS LOUIS ZAREMBA, Ph.D. Ohio State 1960. Canadian balance of payments, 1946-59: Foreign investment and economic development. *Ohio State*.
- YVES-FRANÇOIS ZOLTIVANY, B.A. Loyola (Montreal) 1956; M.A. Montréal 1961. Gilles Hocquart, intendant of New France. *Alberta*.

#### Theses for the Master's Degree

- W. P. ABRAHAM, B.A. Newfoundland 1956. The Church of England in Newfoundland, 1700-1839. *Newfoundland*.



- F. W. C. ABBOTT, B.A. McMaster 1960. Charles Clarke: Clear Grit. *McMaster*.
- RICHARD ALLEN, B.A. Toronto. Salem Bland and the social gospel. *Saskatchewan*.
- A. D. AMERY, B.A. Bishop's 1959; M.A. McGill 1961. Geographic and occupational wage differential in Ontario and Quebec. *McGill*.
- WILLIAM HERBERT ANGUS, M.L. Columbia 1959. The case for the principle against unjust enrichment in Canada. *Columbia*.
- R. G. ARMSTRONG, B.A. Loyola 1956; M.A. McGill 1960. The Standing Committee on Public Accounts, 1946-59. *McGill*.
- SHIRLEY AYER, B.A. Ohio Wesleyan 1955. The Canadian railway strike of 1876-7. *McGill*.
- D. AYRE, B.A. Sir George Williams 1954. The English-language press of Montreal and the South African War, 1899-1900. *McGill*.
- P. J. BANGS, B.A. Toronto 1958. The Liberal party and the election of 1891. *Toronto*.
- JEAN BARIL, B.A. Montréal 1956; M.A. 1961. Des relations entre le phénomène de la grève et les principaux indices d'activité économique. *Montréal*.
- AILEEN E. BARKER, B.A. London 1958. Laurier, French Canada, and the Boer War. *British Columbia*.
- RICHARD BELAND, M.A. Montréal 1961. Relations entre le Canada et les Etats-Unis: étude des problèmes de la diffusion internationales des fluctuations conjoncturelles, 1948-1959. *Montréal*.
- LISLES E. BERRINGER, B.A. Acadia 1952. The Nova Scotia Assembly, 1758-1848. *Acadia*.
- RICHARD BIRD, M.A. Columbia 1960. The taxation of land values in Canada and Australasia. *Columbia*.
- EDWIN ROBERT BLACK, B.A. Western Ontario 1951; M.A. British Columbia 1960. The Progressive Conservative party in British Columbia: Some aspects of organization. *British Columbia*.
- W. J. BLACKERT, B.A. University of New England. Some aspects of a comparative study of Canadian and Australian economic development in the post-war period. *University of New England (Australia)*.
- JAMES WILLMOTT BORCOMAN, B.A. New Brunswick 1955. The seigniorial system in French Canada after 1760. *New Brunswick*.
- GERALD EGERTON BOYCE, B.A. McMaster 1955; M.A. Manitoba 1961. Canadian interest in the Northwest, 1856-1860. *Manitoba*.
- L. J. BOYLE, B.A. Loyola 1957; B.Com. 1958. The problems of passenger traffic on Canadian railways. *McGill*.
- WILLIAM BRESE, B.A. Alberta 1954. An analysis of the sulphur industry in Alberta. *Alberta*.
- G. E. BRIGGS, B.A. Toronto 1959. Alexander Mackenzie: Liberal leader. *McMaster*.
- JOHN P. BUELL, B.A. Toronto 1959. The political career of N. Clark Wallace. *Toronto*.
- F. T. R. BULLEN, B.A. Mount Allison 1959. The relations between Canada and the West Indies, 1910-1940. *Queen's*.
- DUNCAN D. CAMPBELL, B.A.; B.Com. British Columbia 1949; M.A. Alberta 1960. UNESCO: Philosophy, purposes, programming, and policies, 1945-1952. *Alberta*.
- G. L. CAPLAN, B.A. Toronto 1960. Socialism and anti-socialism in Ontario, 1932-45. *Toronto*.
- GEORGE EDWARD CHASE, B.A. Saskatchewan 1961. James A. Calder and Saskatchewan politics. *Saskatchewan*.
- JOHN SPENCER CHURCH, B.A. British Columbia 1945; M.A. 1961. Mining companies in the West Kootenay and Boundary regions of British Columbia, 1890-1900—capital formation and financial operations. *British Columbia*.
- D. N. COHEN (Mrs.), B.A. Toronto 1955. Consumer credit in Canada. *McGill*.
- DOUGLAS COOMBS, B.A. McMaster. Early Baptist education in Western Ontario. *Western Ontario*.
- J. T. COPP, B.A. Sir George Williams 1959. The Canadian general election of 1908. *McGill*.
- J. P. COUSENS, B.A. Queen's 1958. An analysis of the merger activities of Canadian Breweries, Limited. *Queen's*.

- FRANK CRAMM, B.A. Newfoundland 1959; M.A. 1961. The construction of the Newfoundland Railway, 1875-1898. *Newfoundland*.
- LEROY R. CRITCHFIELD, B.S. Brigham Young 1958; M.B.A. New York 1960. An industry study of Canadian insurance stocks. *New York*.
- HARRY CUFF, B.A. Newfoundland 1952; M.A. Acadia 1959. Commission government in Newfoundland. *Acadia*.
- S. L. CYTRYNBAUM, B.A. McGill 1959. Canada and the Common Market. *McGill*.
- WILLIAM GERALD D'ARCY, B.A. Alberta 1954. A comparison of savings habits in the United States and Canada. *New York*.
- PIUS DENIS, B.A. Saskatchewan 1958; B.Com. 1959. The uranium industry of northern Saskatchewan. *Saskatchewan*.
- P. S. DHILLON, A. B. California 1950; M.A. British Columbia 1953; B.Ed. Toronto 1958; M.Ed. 1961. An historical study of aims of education in Ontario, 1800-1900. *Toronto*.
- RICHARD F. DOUGLAS, M.A. Columbia 1960. A paragenetic study of copper-zinc ore body in Ontario, Canada. *Columbia*.
- JOCK M. DRUMMOND, B.A. British Columbia 1947; M.A. 1960. Geographical aspects of school construction and location in the greater Victoria school system. *British Columbia*.
- WALTER DUBINSKI, B.A. Western Ontario. History of the Ukrainians in the Sudbury basin. *Western Ontario*.
- A. P. DUBOIS, B.A. Hunter College 1959. The British and Canadian parliamentary response to the Suez crises, 1956. *McGill*.
- G. G. DUNCAN, B.Sc. London 1957. Transfer payments federal public finance. *McGill*.
- STUART DUNCAN, B.A. Western Ontario. Military suppression of the Canadian rebellions of 1837. *Western Ontario*.
- CHARLES CLIFFORD DUNLOP, B.A. Queen's 1956; M.A. 1960. The origin and development of the International Joint Commission as a judicial tribunal. *Queen's*.
- MELVA J. DWYER, B.A. British Columbia 1943. The relationship of Laurier and the national Liberal party to the British Columbia Liberal party. *British Columbia*.
- J. A. ELLIOTT, B.A. Western Ontario 1959. The mechanism of adjustment of the balance of payments to large inflows of capital in Canada 1949-1959. *Queen's*.
- D. FARQUHARSON, B.A. Toronto 1956. Quebec and the Canadian general election of 1900. *McGill*.
- ROBERT FEARON, B.A. St. Dunstan's 1958. The missionary endeavour of Bishop Angus MacEachern in the Maritime provinces. *New Brunswick*.
- BERNICE FINCK, B.A. Dalhousie 1942. The development of fine arts in the city of Halifax, 1780-1850. *Acadia*.
- GARFIELD FIZZARD, B.A. Newfoundland 1960. Constitutional experiment in Newfoundland, 1840-1848. *Newfoundland*.
- J. E. FOSTER, B.A. Alberta 1959. The Protestant clergy and the Red River Colony. *Alberta*.
- ROBERT J. FRANCIS, B.A. Rochester 1957; M.A. British Columbia 1961. An analysis of British Columbia lumber shipments: 1947-57. *British Columbia*.
- J. M. FRASER. The International Joint Commission (United States-Canada). *Oxford*.
- M. J. GALVIN, B.A. Ottawa 1956. Protestant-Catholic relations in Ontario, 1864-78. *Toronto*.
- JOSEPH A. GATNER, B.A. Ottawa 1951. The defence factor in Confederation of the British North American provinces. *Ottawa*.
- DIRKJE GLERUM-LAURENTIUS (Mrs.), Hist. Cand. Leyden 1957. History of Dutch activity in the Newfoundland fish trade, 1590-1680. *Newfoundland*.
- SHELDON GODFREY, B.A. Toronto 1960. Henri Bourassa and J. S. Ewart. *Rochester*.
- STEPHEN GRADISH, B.A. Western Ontario. The German mercenaries in Canada, 1776-1791. *Western Ontario*.
- C. D. GRIMSON, B.A. McGill 1958. The Communist party in Canada. *McGill*.
- T. GRUEN, B.A. Sir George Williams 1955. The rôle of the mineral industry in Canadian economic development. *McGill*.
- HENRY HEWSON GUEST, B.A. Manitoba 1941; B. Ed. 1946; M.Ed. 1952; M.A. 1961.

- Baldwin of Spadina: The life of William Warren Baldwin, central figure in the movement for responsible government in Upper Canada. *Manitoba*.
- RALPH GUY, B.A. Acadia 1949. The industrialization of Nova Scotia's Pictou County. *Acadia*.
- LYMING HARDING, B.A. Western Ontario 1960. The career of Bishop Medley in New Brunswick. *New Brunswick*.
- SHIRLEY E. CARKNER HART (Mrs.), B.A. Carleton 1957; M.A. Queen's 1961. The elected senate in Canada under the Union. *Queen's*.
- S. H. HARTT, B.A. McGill 1958; M.A. 1961. The role of the state in employer-employee relations: A comparison of France and the province of Quebec. *McGill*.
- IRENE W. D. HECHT, B.A. Radcliffe 1956; M.A., Rochester 1961. Israel De Wolf Andrews and the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. *Rochester*.
- WELF H. HEICK, B.S. Western Ontario 1953; M.A. Queen's 1960. Historical and sociological study of the Lutherans of Waterloo County, Ontario. *Queen's*.
- CHARLES HILLIER, B.A. Newfoundland 1951. The Legislative Council in Newfoundland, 1840-57. *Acadia*.
- E. J. Holmgren, B.A. British Columbia 1947; B.L.S. Toronto 1953. The Bar Colony. *Alberta*.
- DORA SHIH-CHIU HU, A.B. St. John's University (China) 1946; M.B.A. New York 1960. The impact of United States investment on the Canadian balance of payments. *New York*.
- MARYLIN GLYNN HUCK, B.A. Western Ontario 1956. Early settlement in Waterloo County (Upper Canada.) *Toronto*.
- K. D. HUNTE, B.A. London 1959. The educational system of Canada East, 1841-67. *McGill*.
- ELIZABETH ANN HUTTON, B.A. Dalhousie 1960. The Micmac Indians of Nova Scotia to 1834. *Dalhousie*.
- A. M. J. HYATT, B.A. Toronto 1958; M.A. Carleton 1961. The defence of Upper Canada in 1812. *Carleton*.
- E. V. JACKSON, B.A. Toronto 1958. The organization of the Canadian Liberal party, 1867-96. *Toronto*.
- MARJORIE JOHNSTON, B.A. Western Ontario. Anthony Trollope as a social historian. *Western Ontario*.
- MARY JOHNSTON (Mrs.), B.A. Western Ontario. Domain of the West and the Royal Domain in New France. *Western Ontario*.
- CHARLIE F. JOINER, B.A. Delta State College 1959. The work of installing Canadian government under the Act of 1791. *Duke*.
- OAKAH L. JONES, Jr., B.S. U.S. Naval Academy 1953; M.A. Oklahoma 1960. The Spanish occupation of Nootka Sound, 1790-5. *Oklahoma*.
- LAURENCE KELLY, B.Com., M.A. Edinburgh 1959. Labour-management committees in Canada. *Alberta*.
- EUGENE E. R. KING, B.S.A. Saskatchewan 1959; M.A. Alberta 1961. Interregional competition in the western Canadian market for eight fresh vegetables. *Alberta*.
- BEVERLEY KOESTER, B.A. Saskatchewan 1956. The parliamentary career of Nicholas Flood Davin, 1887-1900. *Saskatchewan*.
- HELEN E. KYDD, B.A. McGill 1959. Canada and naval armament before World War I. *Duke*.
- F. B. LAMONT. Canadian monetary policy, 1954-7. *Oxford*.
- W. R. LANGLOIS, B.A. Toronto 1959. The federal election of 1887 in Ontario. *Toronto*.
- CLAUDE LAROCHE, B.A. Montréal 1956; M. A. 1961 Les exportations du Canada vers l'Europe de l'Ouest de 1947 à 1957. *Montréal*.
- TERRENCE LEEDER, B.A. Western Ontario. Public opinion concerning the Boer War in Toronto and southwestern Ontario. *Western Ontario*.
- J. H. LENNON, B.A. Toronto. Philosophical assumptions of Canadian historians. *Western Ontario*.
- D. B. LENTZ, B.A. Queen's 1953. Use of the militia in the suppression of strikes, 1921-6. *Toronto*.

- DAVID LIDSTONE, B.A. Acadia 1937. Land holding in Prince Edward Island. *Acadia*.
- DOROTHY ISABEL LOGGIE, B.A. Alberta 1950; B.Ed. 1952. The Peace River and the Peace River Valley before 1908. *Alberta*.
- D. C. LYNE, B.A. Ireland 1950. The Irish in the Province of Canada, 1850-67. *McGill*.
- DUNCAN C. MCALPINE, B.A. George Williams College 1952. Joseph Howe and the Liberals: His concept of political leadership and party and a re-appraisal of his contribution to Nova Scotian reform up to the collapse of the Falkland Coalition. *Ottawa*.
- F. J. MCGILLY, B.A. St. Francis Xavier 1949. Structural development of a federal political party: The C.C.F. *McGill*.
- D. A. MACLEAN, B.A. New Brunswick 1958; M.A. Dalhousie 1960. European economic integration and its importance for Canada. *Dalhousie*.
- DONALD MACMILLAN, B.A. Mount Allison 1959; B.Ed. 1960. The annexation movement in New Brunswick, 1848-51. *New Brunswick*.
- J. P. MARTYN, B.A. Western Ontario 1955. A study of border problems following the Rebellion of 1837. *Toronto*.
- N. J. MAXWELL, B.A. McMaster 1947; M.A. 1960. The development of the St. Lawrence waterway: A factor in Canadian-American relations. *McMaster*.
- ROGER MENDELS, B.Com. McGill 1958; M.A. 1960. Some implications of Canadian tax law on growth. *McGill*.
- LAURENT MICHAUD, M.A. Montréal 1961. L'influence du travail et du capital sur la production au Québec et au Canada, 1933-1957, 1948-1957. *Montréal*.
- D. D. M. MILLAR, B.A. Western Ontario 1955. The election of 1878 in Canada. *Toronto*.
- G. I. MITTON, B.A.; LL.B.; LL.M. Dalhousie 1960. A survey of indictable offences in Canada and comparison with Nova Scotia and the city of Halifax. *Dalhousie*.
- JACQUES MONET, B.A. Montréal 1955; M.A. Toronto 1961. The crown and politicians: A study in French-Canadian loyalism, 1840-8. *Toronto*.
- EDWARD C. MOULTON, B.A. Newfoundland 1957. The political history of Newfoundland, 1861-1869. *Newfoundland*.
- J. MUGGERIDGE, B.A. Cambridge 1957. The relations between the reform movements in Upper and Lower Canada during the 1830's. *Toronto*.
- S. M. NASEER, B.A. Aligarh Muslim University 1957. Parliamentary control of public corporations in Canada. *McGill*.
- PETER F. NEARY, B.Sc. Newfoundland 1959. The French Shore question in Newfoundland, 1865-1878. *Newfoundland*.
- J. S. O'CONNOR, B.A. Detroit under the British, 1760-1796. *Western Ontario*.
- MABEL OLNEY, A.B. Rochester 1935. William Lyon Mackenzie's Rochester Years. *Rochester*.
- JACOB PARSONS, B.A. Newfoundland 1954. The origins of Wesleyan Methodism in Newfoundland. *Newfoundland*.
- VIOLA E. PARVIN, B.Sc. East Tennessee State College 1945; M.Sc. Tennessee 1950; Ed.D. Toronto 1961. Authorization of textbooks for the elementary schools of Ontario, 1846-1950. *Toronto*.
- I. PEMBERTON, B.A. Bishop's 1958. The Anti-Slavery Society of Canada. *Toronto*.
- A. PETRIE, B.A. McMaster 1947. A history of Welland county, 1783-1830. *McMaster*.
- SERAPH M. PETRUSA, B.A. Queen's 1958; M.A. Columbia 1959. Canadian participation in the United Nations. *Columbia*.
- M. R. H. PIERCY, B.A. Birmingham 1955. Ireland and Irish emigration, 1846-60. *Birmingham*.
- DONALD POYNTER, B.A. New Brunswick 1958. The premiership of John James Fraser in New Brunswick, 1878-82. *New Brunswick*.
- L. F. RAPHAEL, B.Sc. McGill 1958. Econometric model of the Canadian economy. *McGill*.
- JOHN MERCER REID, B.A. Manitoba 1959; M.A. 1961. The erection of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Winnipeg. *Manitoba*.
- WILLIAM CHARLES REUTER, A.B. California 1952; A. M. 1959. The promotion of immigration by the Government of Canada, 1896-1914. *California*.

- H. W. RICHARDSON. British overseas investments in the British empire, 1900-1939. *Manchester*.
- RONALD STUART RITCHIE, B.A. Western Ontario; M.A. Queen's 1960. NATO, the economics of an alliance. *Queen's*.
- E. ROSKIES (Mrs.), B.A. McGill 1954; M.A. 1960. Liberalism of Mackenzie King. *McGill*.
- DAVIS R. B. ROSS, B.A. New York 1960. Canadian-American relations under the Liquor Treaty (1924-33): A study of attempts at international liquor traffic control. *New York*.
- J. H. ROSS, B.A. Mount Allison 1956; B.Ed. 1957. Canadian history—privateering in the War of 1812. *London*.
- JEAN-PAUL ROULEAU, B.A. Montréal 1948; L. Théo. 1956. Les investissements dans le Québec et l'Ontario, 1935-1955. *Montréal*.
- ROY HERBERT RUTH, B.A. Manitoba 1934; M.A. 1953; B.Ed. 1955; M.Ed. 1960. A history of education in Manitoba. *Manitoba*.
- ALEXANDER WILLIAM RUSSELL, M.A. Edinburgh 1960; M.A. Manitoba 1961. The twilight of federalism: A comparative study of recent developments in Canadian and Australian federalism. *Manitoba*.
- JAMES P. RYAN, B.A. Ottawa 1956. The *London Advertiser*, 1871-1891. *Western Ontario*.
- GEORGES SCHOETERS, B.A. Montréal 1955. L'importation de capitaux au Canada. *Montréal*.
- N. S. SCOTT, A.B. Wellesley 1959. Canadian defence policy. *McGill*.
- H. SHIBATA, B.A. Nobe University, Japan 1953. The impact of Japanese-Canadian trade on Canadian industry. *McGill*.
- ALFRED H. SIEMENS, B.A. British Columbia 1956; M.A. 1960. Mennonite settlement in the lower Fraser Valley, British Columbia. *British Columbia*.
- D. F. SIGSWORTH, B.A.; B.Sc.; M.A.; LL.B.; LL.M. Dalhousie 1960. Some considerations relating to jurisdiction over fundamental human rights under the Canadian constitution. *Dalhousie*.
- JEAN MARY SMITH, B.A. Bristol 1958. The *Toronto Globe* and the manpower problem, 1914-18. *Queen's*.
- S. G. D. SMITH, B.A. McGill 1953; B.A. Oxford 1955; B. Litt. 1959. Politics and the party system in the three Prairie Provinces, 1917-58. *Oxford*.
- DUFFERIN STEWART SPAFFORD, B.A. Saskatchewan 1960; M.A. 1960. The development of public telephone systems in the prairie Provinces since 1930. *Saskatchewan*.
- SHIRLEY K. SPAFFORD, B.A. Saskatchewan 1959; M.A. 1960. The development of financial policies in Saskatchewan under Charles Avery Dunning. *Saskatchewan*.
- ALBERT FREDERICK SPROULE, B.Ed. Alberta 1954. The life and influence on the development of the Canadian West of Senator Patrick Burns. *Alberta*.
- R. M. STAMP, B.A. Western Ontario 1959. The political career of James D. Edgar. *Toronto*.
- R. C. STEVENS, B.A. Western Canadian immigration in Sir Clifford Sifton's time. *Western Ontario*.
- GEORGE STOCK, B.A. The Irish Catholics of Sudbury, Ontario, 1883-1930. *Western Ontario*.
- CATHERINE E. STORER, B.A. Durham; M.A. Western Ontario 1961. Third party intervention and wage determination: The Canadian experience, 1948-58. *Western Ontario*.
- E. S. S. SUNDERLAND. Twentieth-century English and British empire church history (Anglican), with particular attention to church-state relationships. *Cambridge*.
- RALPH M. SUSMAN, B.A. Scranton 1955. The Toronto experiment: A new concept in local government. *New York*.
- T. H. B. SYMONS, B.A. Toronto 1951; B.A. Oxford 1953. The "Pacific Scandal." *Toronto*.
- FERNAND TANGUAY, B.A. Le Bicaméralisme et son application au Sénat canadien. *Ottawa*.
- C. T. TAYLOR, B.A. Cambridge 1959. The application of the theory of the firm to the Canadian iron and steel industry. *McGill*.

- GORDON GEORGE THIESSEN, B.A. Saskatchewan 1959. A study of transportation on the Athabaska-Mackenzie river system since 1930. *Saskatchewan*.
- G. J. TULCHINSKY, B.A. Toronto 1957; M.A. McGill 1961. The construction of the first Lachine Canal, 1819-1826. *McGill*.
- J. R. TURNBULL, B.A. Toronto 1952. The attitude of Canada West towards Confederation, 1864-7. *Toronto*.
- W. B. TURNER, B.A. Toronto 1956. The career of Isaac Brock in Canada. *Toronto*.
- H. VAN DE WETERING, B.Sc. McGill 1959. The economics of forage production and utilization in Quebec. *McGill*.
- ROBERT I. VEXLER, B.A. Cornell 1959; M.A. Rochester 1961. The Alaska Boundary award. *Rochester*.
- C. R. VINCENT, B.A. Newfoundland 1960. The Newman Companies in Newfoundland, 1812-1832. *Newfoundland*.
- JOHN WARNER, B.Sc. London 1948; M.A. Alberta 1960. Development of the mineral resources of northern Canada. *Alberta*.
- ELIZABETH PIKE WELLS (Mrs.), B.A. Newfoundland 1959. The introduction of responsible government in Newfoundland, 1846-1855. *Newfoundland*.
- MARY E. WHITESIDE, B.A. Dalhousie 1957. The Intercolonial Railway and public opinion in the Maritimes, 1850-1876. *Toronto*.
- J. R. H. WILBUR, B.A. Mount Allison 1947; M.A. Queen's 1961. H. H. Stevens and the formation of the Reconstruction party. *Queen's*.
- G. H. WILSON, B.A. London; M.A. McGill 1961. The application of steam to St. Lawrence River navigation, 1809-1840. *McGill*.
- K. WILSON, B.A. Sheffield 1952; M.A. 1953; B.Ed. Manitoba 1958. The development of Canadian universities. *Manitoba*.
- C. E. WOOD, B.A. Manitoba 1956. Fiscal problems of the province of Ontario, 1924-1959. *Queen's*.
- ELLA K. WORTHINGTON, M.A. Columbia 1960. The political status of the Grand River Iroquois. *Columbia*.
- L. ZOLF, B.A. Manitoba 1956. The C.I.O. and Canadian-American politics, 1937-8. *Toronto*.



## Recent Publications Relating to Canada

PREPARED IN THE EDITORIAL OFFICE OF  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS  
BY MARION MAGEE

NOTICE in this bibliography does not preclude a later and more extended review.

The following abbreviations are used: C.H.R.—*Canadian Historical Review*; C.J.E.P.S.—*Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*; R.H.A.F.—*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*.

See also *Canadiana*, a monthly list of Canadian publications prepared by the National Library, Ottawa; *External Affairs*, published monthly by the Department of External Affairs; *Journal of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth*, issued quarterly by the General Council of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; and, in the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, "Letters in Canada," published in the July issue.

Sections of the bibliography omitted from this issue for reasons of space will be included in later issues.

### I. CANADA'S COMMONWEALTH AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

CAMPBELL, A. E. *Great Britain and the United States, 1895-1903*. London: Longmans, Green and Company Limited [Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company]. 1960. Pp. viii, 216. \$5.40. To be reviewed later.

GRAEBNER, NORMAN A. Politics and the Oregon Compromise (*Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, LII (1), Jan., 1961, 7-14).

SPICER, KEITH. The Administration of Canadian Colombo Plan Aid (*International Journal*, XVI (2), spring, 1961, 169-82).

WILLOUGHBY, WILLIAM R. *The St. Lawrence Waterway: A Study in Politics and Diplomacy*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press. 1961. Pp. xvi, 381, illus. \$6.00. To be reviewed later.

United States. *Foreign Relations, Diplomatic Papers, 1945: The Conference of Berlin (The Potsdam Conference)*. In two volumes. Washington: United States Government Printing Office for the Department of State. 1960. Pp. cxxviii, 1088; clxxvi, 1645, illus. \$6.00; \$6.50.

— *Treaties in Force: A List of Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States in Force on January 1, 1961*. Department of State Publication, 7132. Washington, D.C.: Treaty Affairs Staff, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State. 1961. Pp. viii, 296. \$1.50. This includes a section on Canadian-American treaties.

## II. HISTORY OF CANADA

## (1) General History

- ANGERS, FRANÇOIS-ALBERT. *Nouvelle Orientation des relations financières fédérales-provinciales (L'Actualité Economique, XXXVI (4), jan.-mars 1961, 723-33).*
- COWAN, HELEN I. *British Emigration to British North America: The First Hundred Years.* Revised and enlarged edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1961. Pp. xiv, 321. \$6.95. To be reviewed later.
- CRYSDALE, STEWART. *The Industrial Struggle and Protestant Ethics in Canada: A Survey of Changing Power Structures and Christian Social Ethics.* Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1961. Pp. xvi, 193. \$4.00. To be reviewed later.
- GARA, LARRY. *The Liberty Line: The Legend of the Underground Railroad.* Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press. 1961. Pp. xii, 201. \$5.00.
- GHOBASHY, OMAR Z. *The Caughnawaga Indians and the St. Lawrence Seaway.* New York: The Devon-Adair Company. 1961. Pp. xii, 137, maps.
- MURRAY, KEITH A. The Role of the Hudson's Bay Company in Pacific Northwest History (*Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, LII (1), Jan., 1961, 24-31). Illustrated.
- SAYWELL, JOHN T., ed. *Canadian Annual Review for 1960: A Reference Guide and Record.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1961. Pp. xviii, 401. \$15.00. To be reviewed later.

## (3) New France

- BEST, HENRY. L'Etat culturel de la Nouvelle-France lors de la cession (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, XV (9), mai 1961, 836-41).
- DUMAS, SILVIO. Le Billet de Dollard (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, XV (8), avril 1961, 709-15).
- ECCLES, W. J. The History of New France according to Francis Parkman (*William and Mary Quarterly*, XVIII (2), April, 1961, 163-75).
- POULIOT, ADRIEN. La Thèse de la course aux fourrures (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, XV (9), mai 1961, 814-31). C'est l'avant-dernier d'une série d'articles sur Dollard des Ormeaux.
- SÉGUIN, ROBERT-LIONEL. *La Sorcellerie au Canada français du XVIIe au XIXe siècles.* Montréal: Librairie Ducharme Limitée. 1961. Pp. 188. \$2.50.

## (4) British North America before 1867

- BAUMAN, ROBERT F. Ottawa Fleets and Iroquois Frustration (*Northwest Ohio Quarterly*, XXXIII (1), winter, 1960-61, 6-40). Illustrated.
- GRAF, HANS. *Probleme der britischen Reichspolitik in Kanada: Die Rebellion von 1837.* Schriften der Philipps-Universität, Marburg, 7. Marburg: N. G. Elwert Verlag. 1960. Pp. 32. DM 4.50.
- GRESSLEY, GENE M. The Red River Settlement: Chaos and Emerging Order (*North Dakota History*, XXVII (3 and 4), summer and fall, 1960, 152-66).
- JACKSON, ERIC. The Organization of Upper Canada Reformers, 1818-1867 (*Ontario History*, LIII (2), June, 1961, 95-116).
- KOCH, ERIC, and TOVELL, VINCENT. *Success of a Mission: Lord Durham in Canada.* A play for television. With JOHN T. SAYWELL. Toronto and Vancouver: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited. 1961. Pp. vi, 62. \$1.25.
- LANDON, FRED. *An Exile from Canada to Van Diemen's Land: Being the Story of Elijah Woodman, Transported Overseas for Participation in the Upper Canada Troubles of 1837-38.* Introduction by JAMES GIBSON. Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company. 1960. Pp. xiv, 321. \$5.00.
- PULLEN, H. F. *The March of the Seamen.* Occasional Paper, 8. Halifax: Maritime Museum of Canada. 1961. Pp. 22, illus., map. The story of their march from the Maritimes to Kingston during the War of 1812.

## (5) Canada since 1867

- MCDUGALL, DUNCAN M. Immigration into Canada, 1851-1920 (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XXVII (2), May, 1961, 162-75).

- NEWHOOK, FRED J. Newfoundland's First Rejection of Confederation: The Election Campaign of 1869 (*Newfoundland Quarterly*, LX (1), spring, 1961, 32-7).
- OSLER, E. B. *The Man Who Had To Hang: Louis Riel*. Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company. 1961. Pp. viii, 320. \$5.00. To be reviewed later.
- OSTRY, BERNARD. Conservatives, Liberals, and Labour in the 1880's (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XXVII (2), May, 1961, 141-61).
- SAYWELL, JOHN T., ed. *The Canadian Journal of Lady Aberdeen, 1893-98*. Toronto: The Champlain Society. 1960. Pp. lxxxiv, 517, illus. Free to members. Reviewed in this issue.
- SCARROW, HOWARD A. By-elections and Public Opinion in Canada (*Public Opinion Quarterly*, XXV (1), spring, 1961, 79-91). The author's analysis covers the by-elections that occurred in the years 1921-58.
- Two Letters of Sir John A. Macdonald to Sir John Bourinot*. Ottawa: Privately published. 1961. Unpagged. Available from Arthur S. Bourinot, Rockcliffe Park, Ottawa, \$2.00.

### III. PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL HISTORY

#### (1) Atlantic Provinces

- ENGLISH, LEO E. F. Britain's oldest Colony (*Newfoundland Quarterly*, LX (1), spring, 1961, 9, 38).
- ERSKINE, J. S. Politics and Education in Nova Scotia (*Dalhousie Review*, XL (1), spring, 1961, 5-14).
- STEVENS, JOHN R. *The Story of H.M. Armed Schooner Tecumseth*. Occasional Paper, 9. Halifax: Maritime Museum of Canada. 1961. Pp. 9, illus.
- SUTHERLAND, MAXWELL. Case History of a Settlement (*Dalhousie Review*, XL (1), spring, 1961, 65-74). The author discusses the settlement of German mercenaries in Nova Scotia after the American Revolution.
- THORBURN, HUGH G. *Politics in New Brunswick*. Canadian Government Series, 10. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1961. Pp. x, 217. \$6.00. To be reviewed later.

#### (3) The Province of Ontario

- BANNISTER, J. A. Some North Shore Ports (*Inland Seas*, XVI (4), winter, 1960, 290-308; XVII (1), spring, 1961, 31-8). The author describes some of the ports on the north shore of Lake Erie.
- EARL, D. W. L. British Views of Colonial Upper Canada (*Ontario History*, LIII (2), June, 1961, 117-136).
- FOX, W. SHERWOOD. *When Sir John A. Put His Foot Down: The Fruits of Inflation and Injustice on Southwestern Ontario's Last Frontier, the Bruce Peninsula*. Western Ontario History Nuggets, 29. London, Ontario: Lawson Memorial Library, University of Western Ontario. 1961. Pp. 13.
- MILLER, ORLO. The Fat Years and the Lean: London (Canada) in Boom and Depression, 1851-61 (*Ontario History*, LIII (2), June, 1961, 73-80).
- ZASLOW, MORRIS. Rendezvous at Moose Factory, 1882 (*Ontario History*, LIII (2), June, 1961, 81-94). Professor Zaslow has written the introductory note to a series of letters despatched by Church of England missionaries to the Church Missionary Society from Moose Factory.

#### (4) The Prairie Provinces

- JOHNSON, GILBERT. The Roumanians in Western Canada (*Saskatchewan History*, XIV (2), spring, 1961, 64-70).
- MACLEAN, JOHN. Blackfoot Medical Priesthood (*Alberta Historical Review*, IX (2), spring, 1961, 1-7).
- NIDDRIE, JOHN G. Pioneering in Eagle Valley (*Alberta Historical Review*, IX (2), spring, 1961, 8-11). Illustrated.
- RED, IDA MAY. Good Hope Days (*Alberta Historical Review*, IX (2), spring, 1961, 22-4). The author relates some early history of Beaver Hills, Alberta.

- STEELE, C. FRANK. *Prairie Editor: The Life and Times of Buchanan of Lethbridge*. Foreword by ARTHUR R. FORD. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1961. Pp. xii, 196. \$4.50. To be reviewed later.
- THORLAKSON, P. H. T. The Shaping of the New Canada (*Icelandic Canadian*, XIX (3), spring, 1961, 15-27). Illustrated.
- TURNER, ALLAN R., ed. The Letters of P. G. Laurie (*Saskatchewan History*, XIV (2), spring, 1961, 41-63). P. G. Laurie established the *Saskatchewan Herald*, the first newspaper in the North West Territories.
- WALLACE, JAMES NEVIN. Early Explorations along the Bow and Saskatchewan Rivers (*Alberta Historical Review*, IX (2), spring, 1961, 12-21). Illustrated.

#### (6) Northwest Territories, Yukon, and the Arctic

- HATTERSLEY-SMITH, G. Peary's North Pole Journey (*Beaver*, outfit 292, summer, 1961, 36-9). Illustrated.
- MAXWELL, MOREAU S. The Movement of Cultures in the Canadian High Arctic (*Anthropologica*, II (2), 1960, 177-89).
- OSWALT, WENDEL H., and VANSTONE, JAMES W. The Future of the Caribou Eskimos (*Anthropologica*, II (2), 1960, 154-76).
- PATTERSON, R. M. The Nahany Lands (*Beaver*, outfit 292, summer, 1961, 40-7). Illustrated. J. M. McLeod's exploration of the South Nahanni River country in 1823 and 1824.

### VI. GENEALOGY

- CONSTANT, PHILIPPE. La Famille Guertin, de Laprairie (*Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, XII (4), avril 1961, 107-16).
- GALLANT, PATRICE. Les Registres de la Gaspésie (*Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, XII (6), juin 1961, 173-80).
- LEFEBVRE, JEAN-JACQUES. La Famille Malhiot, de Laprairie (*Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, XII (5), mai 1961, 149-54).
- Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, XII (4), avril 1961, contient ces études: "L'Ancêtre Mathurin Chabot," par Roger-B. Gauthier; "La Famille Coache," par Raoul Raymond; et "François Pinsonneau dit Lafleur," par Roland-J. Auger.
- Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, XII (5), mai 1961, contient ces études: "La Famille Bourassa, de Laprairie," par Jean-Jacques Lefebvre; "Fervac-Larose," par Raoul Raymond; "En lisant la Famille Lamothe," par Léo-M. Lomme; et "Fagnant."
- Mémoires de la Société généalogique canadienne-française*, XII (6), juin 1961, contient ces études: "La Famille Lemay," par Bersyl; Marenger-Amaringer," par Stella Lemieux; "Une Famille religieuse, celle des Girard," par Sr. M.-du-S. Coeur de Marie; et "Forcier dit Gaucher."

### VII. ARTS AND SCIENCES

#### (1) Literature, Art, and Music

- Archives des lettres canadiennes: Mouvement littéraire de Québec, 1860*. Ottawa: Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa. 1961. Pp. 135-349. Ce livre est un réimpression de *La Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, avril-juin, 1961.
- BOOTH, MICHAEL R. The Beginnings of Theatre in British Columbia (*Queen's Quarterly*, LXVIII (1), spring, 1961, 159-68).
- HASKINS, JOHN. Le Niveau culturel des colonies anglaises en 1760 (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, XV (8), avril 1961, 726-34).
- MOON, BARBARA. Genius in Hiding: David Milne (*Maclean's*, LXXIV (12), June 17, 1961, 15-17, 48-50). Illustrated.
- PACEY, DESMOND. A Garland for Bliss Carman (*Atlantic Advocate*, LI (8), April, 1961, 17-24). Illustrated.
- ROBERT, GUY. Littérature 1960 (*Revue Dominicaine*, LXVII (1), avril 1961, 147-54).

## (2) Science, Industry, and Agriculture

- BIRD, RALPH D. *Ecology of the Aspen Parkland of Western Canada in Relation to Land Use*. Ottawa: Research Branch, Canada, Department of Agriculture. 1961. Pp. x, 155, illus. \$3.00.
- FISCHER, L. A. Implications of European Integration for Canadian Agricultural Exports (*Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, IX (1), 1961, 1-12).
- LOWE, A. BURNETT. Canada's First Weathermen (*Beaver*, outfit 292, summer, 1961, 4-7).
- PAINT, H. M. Sailing Days down East (*Canadian Banker*, LXVIII (1), spring, 1961, 113-21). Illustrated. The author concentrates on the problems of financing ship-building during the nineteenth century in the Maritimes.
- SHARLIN, HAROLD I. The First Niagara Falls Power Project (*Business History Review*, XXXV (1), spring, 1961, 59-74).

## Books Received

- ADAM OF BREMEN. *History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by FRANCIS J. TSCHAN. Records of Civilization Sources and Studies, LIII. New York: Columbia University Press [Toronto: Oxford University Press]. 1959. Pp. xxxiv, 253. \$6.50.
- ALFIERI, VITTORIO. *Of Tyranny*. Translated, edited, and with an Introduction by JULIUS A. MOLINARO and BEATRICE CORRIGAN. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1961. Pp. xxxvi, 120. \$4.75.
- American Foreign Policy: Current Documents, 1957*. Washington, D.C.: Department of State. 1961. Pp. xlii, 1713. \$5.25.
- Annali, I. Napoli, Italia: Università degli studi di Napoli, Istituto de Storia Economica e Sociale. 1960. Pp. iv, 470.
- APPLETON, WILLIAM W. *Charles Macklin: An Actor's Life*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1960. Pp. x, 280. \$6.00.
- ARON, RAYMOND. *Introduction to the Philosophy of History: An Essay on the Limits of Historical Objectivity*. Translated by GEORGE J. IRWIN. Boston: Beacon Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1961. Pp. 351. \$9.00.
- BARROW, G. W. S., ed. *The Acts of Malcolm IV, King of Scots, 1153-1165, Together with Scottish Acts prior to 1153 Not Included in Sir Archibald Lawrie's "Early Scottish Charters"*. Edinburgh: The University Press [Chicago: Quadrangle Books, Inc.]. 1960. Pp. xvi, 339. \$12.50.
- BELL, ARTHUR E. *Newtonian Science*. London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Limited [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1961. Pp. x, 176. \$4.10.
- BELOCH, KARL JULIUS. *Bevölkerungsgeschichte Italiens. III. Die Bevölkerung der Republik Venedig, des Herzogtums Mailand, Piemonts Genuas, Corsicas und Sardinien die Gesamtbevölkerung italiens*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co. 1961. Pp. xvi, 401. DM 68.
- BRUNDAGE, JAMES A. *The Chronicle of Henry of Livonia: A Translation with Introduction and Notes*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press. 1961. Pp. xii, 262. \$5.00.
- BURKHART, J. A., BUSH, H. C., KRISLOV, S., and LEE, R. L. *American Government: The Clash of Issues*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1960. Pp. x, 422. \$3.95.
- BURES, R. V. *The Dynamics of Communism in Eastern Europe*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1961. Pp. xii, 244. \$5.75.
- CARMAN, HARRY J., SYRETT, HAROLD C., and WISHY, BERNARD W. *A History of the American People. I. To 1877*. Revised Edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1960. Pp. xx, 860, xxviii. \$6.75.
- CAUGHEY, JOHN W. *Their Majesties the Mob*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1960. Pp. xii, 214. \$5.00.
- CLARK, GEORGE. *Three Aspects of Stuart England. The Whidden Lectures, V, January, 1960*. London, New York, and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1960. Pp. viii, 77. \$1.75.
- Classics in Sociology: A Course of Selected Reading by Authorities*. With an introductory reading guide by DONALD MACRAE. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc. 1960. Pp. xxiv, 326. \$6.00.
- Classics in Western Civilization: A Course of Selected Reading by Authorities*. With an introductory reading guide by D. C. SOMERVILL. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc. 1960. Pp. xxviii, 338. \$6.00.



- COLLEDGE, ERIC, ed. *The Mediaeval Mystics of England*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1961. Pp. x, 309. \$5.95.
- CRAIG, HARDIN. *New Lamps for Old. A Sequel to The Enchanted Glass*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell [Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Co. Ltd.]. 1960. Pp. xii, 244. \$5.00.
- CROOK, WILFRID H. *Communism and the General Strike*. Hamden, Conn.: The Shoe String Press, Inc. 1960. Pp. xiv, 483. \$8.75.
- CROWLEY, DESMOND. *The Background To Current Affairs*. Second edition. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. [Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1960. Pp. x, 375. \$3.60.
- DASH, S. C. *The Constitution of India: A Comparative Study*. 1960. Allahabad: Chaitanya Publishing House. Pp. viii, 504. \$4.00.
- DE LA COSTA, H., S.J. *The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581-1768*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1961. Pp. xiv, 702. \$14.40.
- DEMARCO, DOMENICO. *Il Crollo del Regno delle due Sicilie*. Biblioteca degli "Annali" dell'Istituto di Storia Economica e Sociale, 1. Naples: Università degli Studi di Napoli. 1960. Pp. xiv, 214.
- DI SOMMA, CARLO. *Il Banco dello Spirito Santo dalle origini al 1664*. Biblioteca degli "Annali" dell'Istituto di Storia Economica e Sociale, 2. Naples: Università degli Studi di Napoli. 1960. Pp. ii, 97.
- DRIVER, HAROLD E. *Indians of North America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1961. Pp. xviii, 668, illus. \$10.95.
- EBERHARDT, NEWMAN C. *A Summary of Catholic History. I. Ancient and Medieval History*. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co. 1961. Pp. xii, 879. \$12.00.
- FAKHRY, AHMED. *The Pyramids*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1961. Pp. x, 260. \$5.95.
- FERRERO, GUGLIELMO. *The Gamble: Bonaparte in Italy, 1796-7*. Translated by BERTHA FRITCHARD and LILY C. FREEMAN. London: G. Bell and Sons [Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited]. 1961. Pp. xii, 305. \$5.00.
- FINER, HERMAN. *The Presidency, Crisis and Regeneration: An Essay in Possibilities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1960. Pp. xiv, 374. \$6.95.
- FLETCHER, ROBERT H. *Free Grass to Fences: The Montana Cattle Range Story*. Illustrations by CHARLES M. RUSSELL. New York: Published for the Historical Society of Montana by University Publishers Incorporated. 1960. Pp. xx, 236. \$12.00.
- GABRIEL, ASTRIK L. *Skara House at the Mediaeval University of Paris: History, Topography, and Charters*. Texts and Studies in the History of Mediaeval Education, IX. With résumés in French and Swedish. Notre Dame, Indiana: The Mediaeval Institute, University of Notre Dame. 1960. Pp. 195. \$4.00.
- GIBBON, EDWARD. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. An abridgement by D. M. Low. 1960. London: Chatto and Windus [Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited]. 1960. Pp. xx, 924. \$8.00.
- GIBBS, PHILIP. *The Riddle of the Changing World*. London: Angus and Robertson Limited [Toronto: The Ryerson Press]. 1960. Pp. 206. \$4.00.
- GIPSON, LAWRENCE HENRY. *The British Empire before the American Revolution. III. The British Isles and the American Colonies: The Northern Plantations, 1748-1754*. Revised edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1960. Pp. xlviii, 294, lxi. \$8.50.
- HAGAN, WILLIAM T. *American Indians*. Chicago History of American Civilization edited by DANIEL J. BOORSTIN. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1961. Pp. xii, 190. \$4.50.
- HALPERN, BEN. *The Idea of the Jewish State*. Harvard Middle Eastern Studies, 3. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1961. Pp. xviii, 492. \$11.95.
- HESSLETTINE, WILLIAM B., and WOLF, HAZEL C. *The Blue and the Grey on the Nile*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1961. Pp. xii, 290. \$5.00.
- HUNT, WALLIS. *Heirs of Great Adventure: The History of Balfour, Williamson and Company Limited. I. 1851-1901; II. 1901-1951*. London: For the Company. 1951. Pp. 216, 264.

- HSÜEH, CHÜN-TU. *The Chinese Communist Movement, 1921-1937: An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Materials in the Chinese Collection of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace*. Hoover Institution Bibliographical Series, VIII. Stanford, Calif.: The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace. 1960. Pp. 131. \$2.50.
- IRWIN, MARGARET. *That Great Lucifer: A Portrait of Sir Walter Raleigh*. Toronto and Vancouver: Clarke, Irwin & Company, Ltd. in association with Chatto & Windus, London. 1960. Pp. 320. \$5.50.
- JACQUEMYNS, G. *Langrand-Dumonceau, promoteur d'une puissance financière catholique. I. Années obscures-Montée*. Bruxelles: Université Libre de Bruxelles. 1960. Pp. 322. 260 francs belges.
- KAPLAN, LOUIS, comp. *A Bibliography of American Autobiographies*. In association with JAMES TYLER COOK, CLINTON E. COLBY, Jr., and DANIEL C. HASKELL. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press. 1961. Pp. xii, 372. \$6.00.
- KUP, A. PETER. *A History of Sierra Leone, 1400-1787*. Cambridge: At the University Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1961. Pp. viii, 212. \$4.50.
- LENGYEL, EMIL. *The Changing Middle East*. New York: John Day Company. 1960. Pp. 376. \$5.75.
- LENNARD, REGINALD. *Rural England, 1086-1135: A Study of Social and Agrarian Conditions*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press [Toronto: Oxford University Press]. 1959. Pp. viii, 409. \$6.75.
- LE TOURNEAU, ROGER. *Fez in the Age of the Marinides*. Translated from the French by BESSE ALBERTA CLEMENT. Centers of Civilization Series, 4. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press [Toronto: Burns & MacEachern Ltd.]. 1961. Pp. xiv, 158. \$3.50.
- LOCKE, FREDERICK W. *The Quest for the Holy Grail: A Literary Study of a Thirteenth-Century French Romance*. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press. 1960. Pp. x, 126. \$3.50.
- LOWENTHAL, DAVID, ed. *The West Indies Federation: Perspectives on a New Nation*. American Geographical Society, Research Series, Number 23. Published in co-operation with the American Geographical Society and Carleton University by Columbia University, New York. 1961. Pp. xiv, 142. \$3.00.
- LUCAS, HENRY S. *The Renaissance and the Reformation*. Second edition. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1960. Pp. xxiv, 757, illus., maps. \$7.50.
- MCCLOY, SHELBY T. *The Negro in France*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press. 1961. Pp. x, 278. \$7.00.
- MARCHAM, FREDERICK GEORGE. *A Constitutional History of Modern England, 1485 to the Present*. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1960. Pp. xiv, 496. \$7.50.
- MARKUS, VASYL. *L'Ukraine soviétique dans les relations internationales, 1918-1923: Etude historique et juridique*. Préface de CHARLES ROUSSEAU. Paris: Les Editions Internationales. 1959. Pp. 326.
- MIDDLETON, DREW. *The Sky Suspended*. New York, London and Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company. 1960. Pp. vi, 282.
- MONAS, SIDNEY. *The Third Section: Police and Society in Russia under Nicholas I*. Russian Research Center Studies, 42. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1961. Pp. xii, 354. \$8.00.
- NEU, IRENE D. *Erastus Corning, Merchant and Financier, 1794-1872*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press [Toronto: Thomas Allen Limited]. 1960. Pp. x, 212. \$4.25.
- NIIVISON, DAVID S., and WRIGHT, ARTHUR F., eds. *Confucianism in Action*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1959. Pp. xiv, 390. \$8.50.
- PARMELEE, MAURICE. *The History of Modern Culture*. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc. 1960. Pp. xii, 1295. \$10.00.
- PIERCE, RICHARD A. *Russian Central Asia, 1867-1917: A Study in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1960. Pp. viii, 359. \$7.00.

---

---

## Notes and Comments

### DICTIONARY OF CANADIAN BIOGRAPHY / DICTIONNAIRE BIOGRAPHIQUE DU CANADA

JUNE 30, 1961, MARKED FOR THE Dictionary of Canadian Biography the end of its first two years, and in several ways the completion of its formative stage. During this period, foundations were laid; procedures for soliciting and handling information created; contacts established with scholars and institutions throughout Canada and in other countries, especially Britain, France, and the United States; the general Name File for the whole of Canadian history built up to a total of over 12,000 cards; the contents and scope of Volume I determined; and assignments made for the writing of over eighty per cent of the approximately 500 articles and notes which it will contain. The superstructure of the Dictionary has thus begun to appear. Most notable of all these developments is the arrangement made with Laval University for a French edition, the Dictionnaire biographique du Canada.

Thursday, March 9, 1961, was memorable in the history of the Dictionary as the day arranged for the formal announcement in Quebec of the French edition, but it was also the date of one of the worst snowstorms Quebec City had experienced in many years. With shops and offices closed and everything at a standstill, the *lancement* had to be postponed to the following evening, but this took nothing from the interest and importance of the occasion, presided over by Mgr. Vachon, the Rector of Laval University. It was regrettable that Mgr. Alphonse-Marie Parent, the Director General of Les Presses de l'Université Laval, was unable to attend as he was on a trip to Europe, but Abbé Fernand Gingras, the Associate Director, was present as well as Mr. Ralph Hodgson, recently appointed "Directeur des Éditions." From Toronto the following were present: Mr. M. Jeanneret, the Director of the University of Toronto Press, and his wife; Miss Frances G. Halpenny, the Editor of the University of Toronto Press; the General Editor and his wife; and Miss Elizabeth W. Loosley, the Assistant to the General Editor. The announcement received excellent notices in the press and on the air.

In making the announcement Mgr. Vachon said in part: "Ces deux éditions, l'une française et l'autre anglaise, qui seront publiées simultanément, nous apparaissent comme le symbole de la collaboration franche et entière qui doit exister dans notre pays entre les universitaires de langue française et ceux de langue anglaise. Nous espérons que cette initiative servira d'exemple et de stimulant et qu'elle contribuera à consolider et à développer les mouvements d'échange et de bonne entente entre les deux grandes races qui constituent notre pays."

The French and English editions are to be the same in content, and it is planned that the two editions of each volume will be issued simultaneously, the English edition by the University of Toronto Press, the French edition by Les

Presses de l'Université Laval. Professor M. Trudel, Director of the Institute of History of Laval, is to be the editor of the French edition. The work will thus be one not merely of translation but of close collaboration at every stage of preparation and publication.

Shortly after the announcement, a biographical research centre was established in the Library of Laval University, with the co-operation of the Librarian, Abbé Hervé Gagné. Mr. André Vachon was appointed to collaborate actively in the work of research and preparation for the DCA/DBC. Following his appointment, detailed arrangements soon began for keeping up the continual consultation and flow of information now necessary between Quebec and Toronto. Such a collaboration involves the maintenance day by day of duplicate files, the mutual consideration of manuscripts submitted, and other problems requiring constant attention in both centres. Such a project has its difficulties, but it is a fascinating one, and worthy of every effort involved since only by a collaboration of this kind can the full resources of both French and English scholarship in Canada be made available to the Dictionary. With its two editions published by two university presses, the Dictionary of Canadian Biography/Dictionnaire biographique du Canada will thus take its place not only as a work of permanent historical value, but in a variety of ways as a truly significant symbol of Canada's biculturalism.

In considering the possibility of a French edition, a very valuable contribution was made by the French-Canadian Consultation Committee consisting of Dean Pierre Dansereau, then of the University of Montreal; Professor M. Brunet, Professor of History of the University of Montreal; Dr. Guy Frégault, then Professor of History of the University of Ottawa; and Professor M. Trudel, Professor of History of Laval University. It was clear that such an edition to be possible must be suitably sponsored in French Canada, and it was on the recommendation of this Committee that an approach was made to Laval University. That the authorities of Laval enthusiastically undertook the responsibility is a cause of sincere congratulation. It is of interest to note that during the past spring Dean Dansereau accepted a position in New York and Professor Frégault was appointed Deputy Minister of the newly-created Department of Cultural Affairs of the Province of Quebec.

During the past year work has gone forward with increased momentum in certain selected periods, and especially for Volume I which will include persons who died up to and including 1700. To build up the Name File and screen it for the final selection of names for a volume, a process of issuing Name Lists has been initiated. These lists, containing the names for a particular region or period which have up to that time been compiled by the DCA staff, are sent out for examination and criticism to a selected list of experts for the region or period in question with a request for additions, corrections, opinions as to relative importance, and so forth. Later, when a particular volume is projected, a printed "Preliminary List of Names under Consideration" for the volume is similarly distributed for a further examination and screening. This entire process, which aims to ensure that experts in the field are fully consulted, has been carried through for Volume I, and the replies received from over one hundred correspondents have been most helpful in providing a basis not only for the final selection of names, but for determining the lengths of articles and the possible contributors. Some idea of what is involved may be indicated by the fact that at an early stage the file for Volume I contained only about one hundred names. Later it went up to over 1200, out of which approximately 500 have been chosen

for inclusion in the volume. The others will remain permanently on file, and doubtless even others will be added.

Volume I has presented some special difficulties of its own, especially because of the large number of persons for whom the documentation is inadequate, and because of the diversity of its contents. New France and Acadia supply about two-thirds of the names to be included, the remainder being in other categories, such as maritime explorers, others connected with the early history of the Gulf of St. Lawrence region, employees of the Hudson's Bay Company, and Indians. The volume will probably contain a larger proportion of short biographies than later volumes, but information on many obscure persons will be one of its most valuable features. For Volume I the Dictionary is particularly indebted to Professor Trudel, who in 1960, before the French edition was arranged, organized in Quebec a sub-committee, consisting of Mr. F. Ouellet, Mr. A. Vachon, and Professor J. Hamelin, to assist in the consideration of the hundreds of names in the file especially for New France. Valuable advice was also given by Dr. Guy Frégault whose books are a notable contribution to the history of New France, and J.-J. Lefebvre, Chief Archivist of the Superior Court, Palace of Justice, Montreal, who is well known as an authority on genealogical and biographical subjects for French Canada. In other categories of names the Dictionary is deeply indebted to a number of scholars on both sides of the Atlantic to whom grateful acknowledgments will be made in due course. The DCB/DBC is already greatly indebted also to almost one hundred contributors who have accepted assignments, often in spite of other heavy obligations. In the great majority of cases the response to the requests to write was prompt and cordial, and we are happy to be already assured that the list of contributors for Volume I will be an excellent one.

While the general Name File covering the whole of Canadian history continues to grow, intensive work has also been started on the file for Volume II, tentatively planned for the years 1701-1740, which already contains over 500 cards, and on the file for the half-century 1851-1900 which may eventually have a volume per decade. It is hoped that a volume in this half-century may soon be projected so that the constituency of contributors and readers may be broadened as soon as possible. Five regional lists for 1851-1900 containing some 2500 names have been issued for examination and criticism. It is hoped that this will bring many further suggestions. The category of Canadians who have had careers worthy of note in other countries is one on which further suggestions will be especially appreciated.

A feature unusual in works of this kind is being initiated in Volume I. This is the inclusion of several short introductory essays and two special indexes. The essays, which will provide a general framework and background for the biographies are tentatively entitled: New France in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; the origins of the French-Canadian and Acadian people; the Atlantic region; the Arctic and Hudson Bay; the Indians and Eskimo. Of the two indexes, one will list points of importance which are specially discussed in certain biographies; the other will give the names of persons, many being persons who did not come to Canada, who are mentioned in particular biographies but do not have articles of their own. It is hoped that Volume I will appear during 1963. This is somewhat later than was suggested in the first announcement for the Dictionary, but additional time is necessary for the preparation of the two editions.

During the year a great many personal contacts have been made as well as

contacts by correspondence. Two trips were made by the General Editor to the Atlantic Provinces, and other trips to Ottawa, Montreal, and Quebec. The Toronto office has had a number of visitors from all parts of Canada, including Professor Trudel, Dr. Guy Frégault, Mr. J.-J. Lefebvre, and, especially in connection with arrangements for the French edition, Mr. André Vachon from the DCB/DBC Quebec office; Mr. Ralph Hodgson; Miss Estelle Lamontagne, recently appointed Information Officer for Laval University; and Mr. Marcel Hamelin, who has worked during the past summer in the biographical research centre in Quebec. Father Jacques Monet, who has made a very valuable contribution during the past two years in the Toronto office, is again, as in 1960, in Montreal giving half time to the DCB/DBC where he is able to do research and writing on a number of articles, and to be in touch with contributors and others interested in the DCB/DBC in that area.

Among the developments of the past year is the formation of two provincial committees on the initiative of the provincial Library Associations of British Columbia and Manitoba and in close association with the provincial archivists, Mr. Willard Ireland in Victoria and Mr. Hartwell Bowsfield in Winnipeg. The British Columbia Committee is chaired by Miss Eleanor Mercer of the Library of the University of British Columbia, the Manitoba Committee by Miss Violet Parker, past president of the Manitoba Library Association. These committees will perform the valuable service of building up biographical Name Files from which the DCB/DBC can make a selection of names for its own file and for the printed volumes. During the past year also Mrs. Constance McFarland, of the Editorial Department of the University of Toronto Press, has been transferred part-time to the Dictionary; and Mrs. Joan Vassilev has been appointed secretary. Mr. W. G. Saywell worked as a part-time assistant on the name file for 1851-1900 during the past year. To these and to his Assistant, Miss Elizabeth Loosley, the General Editor wishes to record his sincere thanks for their untiring efforts.

GEORGE W. BROWN  
General Editor

## HISTORIANS IN CANADA

AT MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY George M. Schwarz, B.A. (Washington), M.A. (Columbia) has been appointed an assistant professor. Professor Schwarz is a candidate for the D.Phil. at Oxford, where he has written a thesis on "Political Attitudes in the German Universities during the reign of William II." Also appointed as an assistant professor is William M. Dobell, B.A. (McGill), M.A. (Oxford), B.Litt. (Oxford), who was previously on the staff of the National Research Council in Ottawa. In 1960 Professor G. O. Rothney, Head of the Department of History, attended the International Congress of Orientalists in Moscow, the International Congress of Historical Sciences in Stockholm, and spent the year doing research in India. In September, 1960, Mr. F. A. Hagar, B.A. (Harvard), M.Litt. (Cambridge), M.A., Ph.D. (California) joined the department as an assistant professor. The Newfoundland Provincial Archives, organized and administered by the Department of History since 1953, were taken over by the provincial government in 1960.

At St. Mary's University, Halifax, Rev. C. B. O'Keefe, S.J., spent 1960-61 on



a Senior Canada Council Fellowship examining the Conservative reactions to the French Enlightenment. At Carleton D. M. L. Farr has been promoted to the rank of professor and S. R. Mealing to that of associate professor. G. S. Couse has been awarded sabbatical leave for the 1961-62 session. D. G. Bowen has joined the department as an assistant professor and Miss Naomi Griffiths as an instructor for 1961-62.

Dr. E. Cappadocia returned to the Royal Military College after a year's leave in Europe. Mr. K. Pryke, who had replaced Professor Cappadocia, received an appointment at the Laurentian University of Sudbury. Professor G. F. C. Stanley was also on leave for the 1960-61 session and was replaced by Dr. J. K. Lindsay, formerly of Memorial. Dr. Stanley also received a Canada Council Fellowship for 1960-61.

At the University of Toronto, Professors Spencer and Zaslow returned from sabbatical in September, 1961, and Professors Saunders (Canada Council), Piepenburg (Nuffield), and White (Nuffield) received leave for 1961-62. Leaving the department are Dr. A. L. Moote who received an appointment at the University of Cincinnati, Dr. J. A. Betley and Dr. Roy Dalton. New appointments include: Dr. C. H. Clough, Dr. H. Senior, Miss Anna Cienciala, Mr. J. J. Gerson, Mr. J. M. Beattie, and Mr. M. B. Fry. Professors Craig and Spencer have been promoted to the rank of associate professor. Professor D. J. McDougall has retired but is continuing in the department as a special lecturer.

Richard C. Overton has joined the department at the University of Western Ontario as Professor of American History. Dr. K. H. W. Kilborn was appointed as lecturer and T. A. Sandquist was promoted to the rank of lecturer. Mr. Laurier LaPierre has left the College of Christ the King and joined the department at Loyola in Montreal.

Professor J. K. McConica returned to Saskatchewan after a two-year leave in Oxford, during which time he was working on his D.Phil. Mr. J. A. Leith left the department to accept an appointment at Queen's University. Mr. Ivo N. Lambi, formerly of the University of Toronto and the University of Omaha, has been appointed an assistant professor. Professor W. R. Graham has been granted a Canada Council Senior Fellowship and is on leave for the 1961-62 session to complete the second volume of his life of Arthur Meighen. Mr. R. Craig Brown and Miss Barbara Fraser, both doctoral candidates at Toronto, have joined the Alberta department, the former going to the Calgary campus.

At the University of British Columbia, Professor F. H. Soward has been appointed Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies. Dr. John M. Norris has been promoted to the rank of associate professor. During the 1961-62 session he is holding a Nuffield Fellowship in England. Dr. Margaret Prang and Dr. Peter Hametty have been promoted to assistant professors. Professor Margaret Ormsby has been awarded a research grant by the American Association for State and Local History for a study of the Canadian west. H. Blair Neatby has returned to the department after a leave of absence in connection with his preparation of the second volume of the Mackenzie King biography. Professor T. J. Hanrahan has been granted further leave of absence to pursue his research in France. Two new instructors have joined the department: Dr. A. Norbert MacDonald of Washington State University and Dr. James H. Winter of Dartmouth College. Mr. Joseph A. Boudreau, a doctoral student at the University of California at Los Angeles has been appointed a sessional lecturer.

The Reverend Noel Mailloux, O.P., Chairman of the Social Science Research Council of Canada, has announced the appointment of Bernard Ostry as associate secretary-treasurer. Prior to his appointment, Mr. Ostry was assistant secretary-

treasurer of the Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Social Science Research Council of Canada. In order to keep the Research Councils constantly informed of the opportunities for the development of their work and to maintain a vital contact with scholars young and old in every part of Canada, Mr. Ostry will be visiting all Canadian universities and colleges during the next few years. Mr. Ostry's reports on national research interests, needs, and developments in the social sciences and humanities will be made available to the Canada Council as well as to the two Research Councils.

#### CONTRIBUTORS

RAMSAY COOK is a lecturer in the Department of History, University of Toronto.

A. L. BURT is Emeritus Professor of History, University of Minnesota, and has just completed a year as a visiting professor at the University of Manitoba.

